

10.24.22

From the Library of
Professor Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

BX 5133 .A1 A3 1898

Advent sermons on church
reform

ADVENT SERMONS
ON
CHURCH REFORM

ADVENT SERMONS
ON
CHURCH REFORM

WITH A PREFACE

BY THE RIGHT REV.
THE LORD BISHOP OF STEPNEY

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1898

All rights reserved

P R E F A C E

BEFORE a patient will see a doctor, it is necessary to convince him first that there is something wrong with him; and this often takes some time. It is the same with Church Reform; the Church is not convinced yet that anything is wrong; custom has a marvellously dulling power, and until the conscience of the Church is quickened to see that all is not as it should be, nothing further will be done.

Now, the object of this little book, and of the sermons which compose it, is to awaken the Church to a consciousness that there are many things in it which prevent it being at present a glorious Church, without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. Perhaps those who go and live among working men wake up to this before others, as they notice the almost complete alienation of the working men, as a class, from the Church altogether—although, it is fair to

say, not more from the Church than any other religious body. The suspicion that something is wrong is increased by noticing the extreme reluctance of rich laymen, with a few notable exceptions, to give at present to the support of the clergy : witness the very half-hearted support given at present to the Clergy Sustentation Fund.

This leads to a more extended view over the field, and the work of what was meant to be an active, mobile, fighting force is found to be choked at every point by the "parson's freehold." Men long past their work remain at their posts with empty churches and unvisited people, though they often have done excellent work in their time, before they were past their prime. By a great effort some sort of pension fund is raised, and the incumbent is persuaded to retire ; but who is to guarantee that the next man will do any better ? If the patron is the Bishop of the diocese, it is pretty certain that, for his own peace of mind, if for no higher motive, a man will be appointed who will suit the people, and do his work : but no sort of voice have the people themselves in the choice of the man who is to be their spiritual pastor and master, perhaps for the next twenty years ;

possibly the living itself is put up to auction, and the next presentation sold in the open market.

Now, all these things and many others stir us up to ask whether there are not some definite causes to account for the indifference of the laymen, and some remedies possible for the open scandals in the Church. Few will be inclined to disagree with the assertion of Canon Gore, in his sermon before the University of Cambridge: "It is a scandal that the cures of souls should be bought like common merchandise in the open market—souls for whom Christ died. It is a scandal that the Church, being what she is, should be so tied in fetters of the State as to have no freedom to manage the affairs committed to her by Christ. It is a scandal that the faithful laity should have no power to prevent an improper appointment to the pastoral office, or to cause the removal of what is no pastor, but an incubus. It is a scandal that the worshipping laity should be utterly at the mercy of an arbitrary incumbent who simply chooses to cause a revolution in the customary worship. It is a scandal that a pastor should be subjected to the unregulated tyranny, or even insults of some wealthy or violent individual among the

inhabitants of his parish. These are serious black blots on the Church's system. These are scandals, and, what is worse, or better, removable scandals—scandals which it lies with us to remove.”¹

Experience, however, shows that it is not too easy to remove them; the antiquity and history of the Church, while it forms its great glory, constitutes also its chief difficulty. An ironclad cannot turn with the rapidity and suppleness of a torpedo boat, and it wants careful thought and patience and tact to reform old abuses: but, on the other hand, we cannot acquiesce in abuses because they are old, nor despair of reform because it is difficult.²

It was with the hope of bringing this matter before the Church that, last Advent, by the courteous permission of the incumbents, courses of sermons on the subject of Church Reform were preached in some West London Churches,³ which are now in substance given to the public.

¹ Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, Sunday, February 13, 1898.

² The Government Bill, introduced within a few days of these lines being written, if carried, will be a useful and acceptable instalment of Church reform.

³ St. Peter's, Eaton Square; the Church of the Annunciation, St. Marylebone; Holy Trinity, Sloane Street; and St. Saviour's, Pimlico.

The courses were arranged under the auspices of the Church Reform League. The principles of the League, and the draft of a bill for the self-government of the Church—the main object of its efforts—are subjoined to the preface as a text to the volume:¹ but the preachers were left entirely free from any obligation except that of general sympathy with its aims, nor is any preacher responsible for anything except his own sermon.

The season of Advent, with its keynote, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," in itself invites our attention to the Church as the *kingdom of God*, and to the difficult problems of its citizenship, government, constitution, and discipline. Detailed discussion, however, of these problems and practical suggestions are to be looked for in essays rather than sermons; and a collection of sermons as the present, which deals with the general ideas, and cannot divide the subject like a logical treatise, cannot avoid a certain amount of repetition. But it will be found that there is a distinct plan in the treatment of the sermons. The first three deal with the *general idea of the*

¹ For further information as to the League, readers are referred to the General Secretary, Mr. Alfred Holdsworth, the Church House, Westminster.

Church as a spiritual kingdom : the next four with the *external relations* to the kingdoms of the world,—nation, state, government, etc.,—in which it is involved. The subjects of Nos. viii.—xi. are questions of its *internal organization*, e.g., government and membership ; while the last three are devoted to a special point, which is a necessary corollary of self-government, viz. the matter of *discipline*.

To make the book more complete some appendices have been added, which afford evidence of the mind and feeling of the Church as shown, first, by the formal resolutions of Church assemblies, and then by the utterances of some individual and representative churchmen among both clergy and laity, amongst which the first place is rightly held by the matured judgment of the Bishop of Durham as delivered to his diocese in a recent address.

A. F. STEPNEY.

2, AMEN COURT,
March 2, 1898.

THE PRINCIPLES

ADVOCATED BY

THE CHURCH REFORM LEAGUE

I. *Self-Government of the Church*.—That, saving the supremacy of the Crown according to law, and, in respect to legislation, subject to the veto of Parliament, the Church have freedom for self-government, by means of reformed Houses of Convocation (which shall be thoroughly representative, with power for the Canterbury and York Convocations to sit together if desired), together with a representative body or bodies of the laity.

II. *Position of the Laity*.—That the laity have the principal share in the administration of finance, and, within the fixed limits of church order, a real control in the appointing of their pastors, and in all matters of ecclesiastical organization and administration a concurrent voice with the clergy. That the communicants of every parish have a recognized power to prevent the arbitrary alteration of lawful customs in ritual.

N.B.—This is not to be understood as encroaching upon the province of the spirituality in relation to matters of faith, worship, and discipline.

III. *Discipline*.—That all ministers and church officers be removable by disciplinary process, benefices being made tenable only during the adequate performance of the duties, and that a “godly discipline” for the laity be established.

N.B. —The term “godly discipline” is explained in C.R.L. leaflet, No. 4.

IV. *Patronage*.—That all transfers by sale of next presentations and advowsons be made illegal, but that where patronage is transferred to a Diocesan Trust (as defined in V.) reasonable compensation may be given.

V. *Finance*.—That in each diocese a Diocesan Trust be formed to receive and administer diocesan and parochial endowments on lines similar to those on which the Ecclesiastical Commissioners administer their trust.

SUGGESTED DRAFT

OF A

BILL FOR THE BETTER GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

WHEREAS it is expedient to provide for the better government of the Church of England,

Be it Enacted, &c.

If Her Majesty shall be pleased to grant letters of business, the Convocations of Canterbury and York may prepare a scheme, whereby representatives of the laity of the said Church in every ecclesiastical Parish may be elected to assemblies, to be called Houses of Laymen, for advising in the general management of the said Church ;

Further, the Convocations of Canterbury and York may prepare a scheme granting to reformed Convocations, in conjunction with such Houses of Laymen, legislative freedom and authority, exercised as hereinafter described, in all matters of discipline, organization, administration and worship in the said Church ;

And when such scheme, or any subsequent scheme, prepared under the powers given by the first scheme, shall

have been presented to Her Majesty by the Presidents of the said Convocations, Her Majesty may, if she see fit, cause the same to be laid before Her two Houses of Parliament for forty days during their session ; and if, within such forty days, neither House address Her Majesty, praying Her to withhold Her assent from such scheme, or any subsequent scheme prepared under the powers given by the first scheme, Her Majesty may, by order in Council, if she see fit, signify Her approval thereof, and cause such approval to be published in the *London Gazette*, whereupon such scheme, or such subsequent scheme, shall have the force of law, as if it had been enacted as part of this Act.

This Act shall come into force on the

This Act may be cited as the Church Government Act,
189 .

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|-----------|
| I. THE CITY OF GOD (PHIL. iii. 20) | I |
| By the REV. T. C. FRY, D.D., Headmaster of Berkhamsted School. | |
| <i>(St. Peter's, Eaton Square, November 28, 1897.)</i> | |
| II. THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST (MATT. iii. 2) . . | 12 |
| By the Very Rev. H. M. LUCKOCK, D.D., Dean of Lichfield. | |
| <i>(Holy Trinity, Sloane Street, November 28.)</i> | |
| III. THE POWER OF THE SPIRIT (MATT. x. 7) . | 28 |
| By the Rev. A. L. LILLEY, B.A., Holy Trinity, Sloane Street. | |
| <i>(St. Saviour's, Pimlico, November 28.)</i> | |
| IV. CHURCH AND NATION (MATT. xxi. 12) . . . | 36 |
| By the Rev. C. E. OSBORNE, B.A., Vicar of Seghill, Northumberland. | |
| <i>(St. Mary's, Bryanston Street, November 28.)</i> | |
| V. SPIRITUAL AND SECULAR (REV. xi. 15) . . | 55 |
| By the Rev. W. E. COLLINS, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College. | |
| <i>(St. Peter's, December 5.)</i> | |
| VI. CHURCH AND STATE (MATT. xxii. 21) . . . | 68 |
| By the Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, B.D., Rector of Welwyn. | |
| <i>(Holy Trinity, December 5.)</i> | |
| VII. FREEDOM AND ESTABLISHMENT (ISA. lx. 17) | 85 |
| By the Rev. V. H. STANTON, D.D., Ely Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, and Canon of Ely. | |
| <i>(St. Saviour's, December 5.)</i> | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| VIII. CHURCH GOVERNMENT (MATT. xviii. 17 ; JOHN xviii. 36) | 95 |
| By the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD. (<i>St. Mary's, December 5.</i>) | |
| IX. CHURCH MEMBERSHIP (I COR. xii. 12-27) . . . | 105 |
| By the Rev. H. S. HOLLAND, M.A., Canon of St. Paul's. (<i>St. Mary's, December 12.</i>) | |
| X. CHURCH WORK (JOHN i. 3) | 118 |
| By the Rev. C. F. ROGERS, M.A., St. Nicholas, Cole Abbey. (<i>St. Saviour's, December 12.</i>) | |
| XI. CHURCH REFORM (JOEL ii. 28, 29) | 132 |
| By the Rev. LUCIUS G. FRY, M.A., Vicar of St. James, Edmonton. (<i>Holy Trinity, December 12.</i>) | |
| XII. GLORY AND DISCIPLINE (EPHES. v. 27) . . . | 146 |
| By the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF STEPNEY. (<i>St. Peter's, December 19.</i>) | |
| XIII. WHEAT AND TARES (LUKE i. 33) | 157 |
| By the Rev. A. ROBERTSON, D.D., Principal of King's College. (<i>St. Mary's, December 26.</i>) | |
| XIV. CHRISTIAN JUDGMENT (I COR. vi. 2) . . . | 165 |
| By the Rev. WILFRID OSBORN, M.A., of the Charter- house Mission, Southwark. (<i>Holy Trinity, December 19.</i>) | |

APPENDICES.

| | |
|--|-----|
| A. Resolutions of Representative Church Bodies on the Self- government of the Church (1897-98) | 175 |
| B. The Address of the Bishop of Durham on Church Reform (October 20, 1897): | 179 |
| C. The Self-government of the Church: by W. S. de Winton, Esq. (May 13, 1897) | 190 |
| D. The Bishop of Rochester, Sir Walter Phillimore, and Canon Gore on Church Reform (May 10, 1897) | 200 |

THE CITY OF GOD.

BY THE

REV. T. C. FRY, D.D.

“Our commonwealth is in heaven.”—PHIL. iii. 20.

WE are all familiar with the Greek conception of the state. Before the Macedonian Alexander dreamt of an imperial Greece, the Greek state, alike in ideal and realization, was the city: to be a patriot was to love one's city: the city at once inspired and limited the philosopher and the politician. Hellas, with its common blood and common tendencies, was a sentiment: the city was the mother of living, practical men. It is not likely that the force of this conception was unknown to him who was *a citizen of no mean city*.

But St. Paul was a Jew as well as a Tarsian: to him there were other cities than Athens and her peers. To him the Greek conception of the city must have been profoundly affected by the Jewish conception of the divine city, that Jehovah loved more than all the dwellings of Jacob—the home of God, that held within its borders the shrine of the Presence, and the greatness of whose history had found its climax in the opportunity it had been granted from

Galilee, and yet had spurned on Calvary. This Jerusalem below of his earlier days became to him, we know, the type of the Jerusalem that is above, the Mother of us all.

Meanwhile, a further contribution to the conception of the city-state was made by Rome, the city-empire. From her, whose citizen he was, St. Paul must have obtained new and lively views of an organized community on a vaster scale than any one, even in the creative age of Pericles, could have dreamt of. The city that was the bond of unity and the source of political life to the known world, that reproduced her own self in colonies, isolated and scattered, yet intimately one with the mother city: so one that mother city was but the head, and colonies the limbs, of one undivided Rome—how clear and decisive a type of the Commonwealth that he was himself striving to found!

Is it any wonder that the thought—the inspired thought, as we believe—came to him that he would make of Christianity the religion of the empire; that he was, by God's predestination and call, to plant within the "carnal" and secular city-empire, a commonwealth of another source, ideal, and destiny; that this commonwealth, this organised community, was also a city-empire like Rome, not confined to the walls of one town like Antioch but in its colonies, essentially one with itself, spreading throughout the world; nay, that it was the very city of God, whose ideal was within the heavens, more sacred than Zion, in that Zion had been at best but a type of this city to come?

Thus to St. Paul's conception of the commonwealth, the organization, that we call the Church, Athens, Rome, Jerusalem, must all have lent some common, some contrasting, elements.

Let us put to ourselves briefly and clearly, what is implied in this conception of a commonwealth.

First, there is an organization: a visible organization: something of which you can say: "this is my city, my state; this is its outward framework; this is its constitution and method of government; these are its citizens; this is its franchise; this the method of admission into it." "You have," surely St. Paul would say, "certain definite rights and duties as a member of this commonwealth. For your commonwealth is *here*, on earth; it is *now*; it is a present kingdom; it is visibly established amongst existing men; it visibly claims your allegiance; it is at once the source and the outcome of your own faithful citizenship."

Secondly, it is in another sense an invisible kingdom; its real life and inspiration, its *raison d'être*, its fount and spring, is within the material veil "in the heavens"; the ideal, that the Church on earth is ever striving after, is a heavenly ideal; the kingdom's sanctions and working are spiritual; its issues and future developments, spiritual. It does not act by secular weapons; it is indifferent to secular distinctions; it does not depend on the majesty or dignity of secular environment; its true life is hid; it is, so far and in a sense, a secret society of consecrated men, whom you cannot know by tongue, face, dress,

or any worldly distinction ; it has a body and a soul ; it is a visible temple resting on an invisible base.

It is, therefore, essential to the very conception that it cannot be organized by the State. An Erastian theory of the Church as merely a department of the State, a national organization for purposes of religion and morality, is obviously inconsistent with the very idea of the Church as a heavenly and spiritual commonwealth. It is not, it simply cannot be, a branch of the Civil Service ; it is, under Christ, an organization of Christians as such.

Yet, opposed as it was to the Roman Empire, independent as it is of secular constitutions and governments, the Church is not, and cannot be, opposed to civil society : it is the very leaven of civil society ; it is destined to permeate and eventually appropriate civil society ; destined to redeem our social life, and to make the kingdoms of this world the kingdoms of Christ. And, while thus independent of the State, and in more than one sense cutting across the limits of secular constitutions, yet the Church remains a commonwealth with a real organization of its own ; and, as such, it must have a civic tone or spirit of its own also. This civic tone rests upon living truth, upon principle. A churchman is such, on principle. He is a member of a body, simply as a Christian. Into the body he was re-born, just as much as he was born (say) an Englishman. "Make disciples, baptizing," was the first commission. The wholesome word of the commission to baptize is inseparable from the commission to make disciples.

Not the conversion of the individual alone, but its issue in baptism is the birth of the Christian into the organization of Christ. The individual convert no more creates the body than newborn children create the family. The home of the child is already there ; so is the home of the newborn. The child completes but does not create, the family ; the individual Christian completes the Church : he "fills up" the Christ.

In this civic tone of the Church is involved a sense of law. The prodigal in the family is in revolt against the loyal law of the family : so at times men may be in revolt against the fundamental laws of the Christian Church. They may even by their own act affect to change or repeal these fundamental laws : only, in that case, their Church would cease to be a part of the "organization in the heavens ;" its unseen base would be gone ; its connection with invisible life would be severed ; and the visible structure only would remain, just as the dead tree remains, a mere lifeless frame that can put forth no leaf and bear no fruit.

The civic tone further demands the loyal co-operation, at times the submission, of the individual. Men cannot all be the executive in a state. So in the Church some are apostles, some prophets, some pastors and teachers. The priesthood has its place and functions, and must not exceed them ; so have laymen, their place, their duties and rights, and must not abandon them. In a duly organized kingdom there is a right and a wrong in most details of organization ; even in the smaller and less essential details there is generally a better and a worse. Wherever

there is organized function, usurpation of function is wrong ; wherever there is freedom in detail, denial of due liberty is also wrong. Wherever such disorder has occurred, then, for the right adjustment of function and freedom, principle and law and precedent are all operative ; and no reconciliation can be effected without patience and humility on the part of all.

On the part of all, I say, for in our Christian commonwealth we all gain or lose together. A citizen cannot neglect the interests of the society without causing suffering or loss to all. He cannot be indifferent to the health of the society, unless he be criminally selfish towards all. He cannot, if he be loyal to the common good, be so much as apathetic about common weakness or common evil. Merely to be indifferent, because to be otherwise would cause him trouble ; to make no effort, because of the personal cost to himself ; to hug his privileges and to be careless of his duties—cannot we imagine what St. Paul would have to say to a citizen such as this ?

Therefore let us remember that there is another element in true civic tone, and that is progress. Evolution, *i.e.* development, is a law of life to the Church as well as to nature and to the state. The history of theology is, in one sense, a history of evolution. In one sense, I say ; for there is a true and a false development. The true development means development in the true line, the true law of being. Evolution in no case means the arbitrary break up of fundamental laws. Fundamental laws are the divine lines of progress. In nature the main line,

once reached, survives ; it becomes essential, capable of variation, but never annihilated. So, too, the fundamental laws of the Christian commonwealth abide. "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus," other constitution can no man fundamentally organize than that which is of Christ Jesus. But in details of structure there must be progress and development to meet new environments ; and it is surely no harder to distinguish between detail and principle in structure, than between opinion and fundamentals in creed. Under God the Church has done the one : under God, who, save the Church, can do the other ?

Englishmen do not need to be told that a constitution, an organized state, can grow, yet remain essentially the same state. It is only paper organizations that do not grow. There is social peril in America just now : it is largely because her organized society cannot grow : growth is against her constitution : she has had her life half frozen into paper conditions. It was not on paper but in life that the bases of organization in the Christian Church were laid. They were, to vary our metaphor, a seed of life and not mere verbal definitions : they had within them, and still have, the power of growth, of development, of adaptation.

Such a development, such progress, necessitates reform. Every organized society of men is human, as the men who compose it are human. And so it is with the Church also ; while it is the chosen home of divine influence, it will none the less be affected

by the mistakes, the apathy, the humanity of men. It is likely to accumulate some useless growths. It will need pruning, to disentangle the useless and cut away the unsound. Judgment begins with the Christian: surely, too, judgment begins with the Church. She must judge herself, if she would not be judged. Shall we not be asked, in God's judgment: where is the Bride of Christ that was committed to your keeping? what did you do for the heavenly commonwealth of which I made you members? did you suffer her robe to acquire stain and blemish, without any effort to remove them? I bid you once by My apostle, walk worthily of this heavenly commonwealth? did you so live in fulfilment of her public interests?

"And they all with one consent began to make excuse."

Excuses can be so easily made even by men not opposed in principle to reform. Some, for instance, as bishops or officials may plead that, however necessary was the call to prune, the practical suggestions emanated from unauthorized sources; and in such cases better no movement at all than any movement that has the least suspicion of being on unconstitutional lines. Others, rectors or incumbents, may plead, as an excuse for having stood aloof, that movements for reform threatened to limit and fetter their own independence; for though the apostle spoke of the clergy as being servants of all, yet in the sphere of their ministry the clergy were to bear rule. Others may be kept back by suspicion of the mind and aspirations of those who would fain be their

fellow-workers in this business. Laymen also will have their own excuses. Some, strangely enough, seem to take a special pride, as laymen, in supporting the excuses of those who are afraid to trust in lawful things the Christian laity. Others see little good in any movement that does not avowedly wear the exclusive colour of their own political party. Others have their own theory of the constitution of the kingdom, and forget that laymen have duties as well as rights. Others have no theory at all, and even seem too apathetic to form a theory. And few seem to ask, whether Christ's Church, Christ's own great weapon and instrument for the redemption of the world, is not having her great work largely hindered by the cold criticism that delights to curb and damp and check and discourage a movement for more freedom as impracticable.

Such are some of the excuses that men make, and thus put aside the call to face a difficult situation, that can only grow more difficult as the years go on. But now is the time to lay excuses aside. At last, we may reverently say, God has given us the opportunity: He has opened a door: He has put it into the minds of churchmen to combine together and with one heart and mind strive for the attainment of that which seems the way of escape from so many evils to the Church. That way is nothing new; it is simply the restoration of what is old, viz. the restoration of constitutional liberty to the Church.¹ That is

¹ See the suggested draft bill put forward by the Church Reform League, on p. xiii.

that the Christian commonwealth should be suffered by a friendly State to develop her own life, with just such care for the secular organization beside her, that seems (but can only seem) to overshadow her, as St. Paul himself would surely have rendered now, as he did then, in all lawful spheres ; nay, as even Christ himself did, when He bid us render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's.

Such is the aim and goal of the efforts of the Church Reform League.¹ Further details of reform that have been formulated are but indications of possible good resulting to the Church by the use of her freedom. But the league pledges no one, not even its members, to these details. How indeed can they? For what they really say is, that the mind of the Church herself must find expression on these matters ; and, what is of chief moment, that the mind of the Church can so find free expression without revolution, if only churchmen will unite. That this is possible is indeed even now the mind of the Church, and has been shown by the fact that, already, bishop after bishop, conference after conference, rural deanery after rural deanery, laymeeting upon laymeeting, have this autumn assented, saying, "This can be done."² That indeed does not mean that there are no difficulties. No one can know better than those who are the most eager for reform that there are difficulties ; but it is certain that there are no difficulties that

¹ For its principles, see p. xi.

² See Appendix A, p. 175.

cannot with unity and patience be overcome. The opportunity is at hand: the opportunity of arousing faithful churchmen to face the situation, to resolve that to find free expression for the Church's voice, free removal of the faults that mar her work, free adaptation to the pressing needs and wide social changes of to-day, is a task for the neglect of which we shall be held responsible by our Master Himself.

And surely faith in Him will not forsake the heart and mind of those who are, it may be, held back by the fear of being carried too far and too fast down stream, when once such work is taken in hand. It cannot be right to bear with acknowledged evil: there are words to the Seven Churches that speak with stern and warning voice: there are memories of a more inspiring vision, that met the toiling and anxious crew, "It is I, be not afraid."

It may indeed be that the "commonwealth in heaven" was to St. Paul a great ideal; but at least he reached out after it; he made it the test and touchstone of the real; by it he judged and condemned and strove to raise the tone of his fellow-churchmen in this world. It is our ideal no less, it is no less our responsibility to strive to realize it. No individual saintliness can do all the Church's work, while the organized body is largely tied and bound. Be it ours to help unbind her.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

BY THE

VERY REV. H. M. LUCKOCK, D.D.

DEAN OF LICHFIELD.

“Repent ye ; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.”—ST. MATT.
iii. 2.

A COMBINED effort is being made this Advent in some of the more important churches of the West End of London to awaken the conscience of the laity to the imperative need of Church Reform. It has devolved upon me to strike the key-note in this congregation.

Now if I take you back many centuries in history, and show what the Church was, in its essential features, when it came fresh from the hands of the Divine Founder, it is that you may the more easily realize whether or not it has fallen away from its prototype. The object of the movement, which has received encouragement¹ from diocese after diocese, assembled in conference, is the recovery of all that is possible of the primitive organization, as it was traced in outline by the incarnate Lord, and filled in

¹ See Appendix A, p. 175.

subsequently by men who were empowered by the Holy Ghost to express the Divine Mind in the process of its development. If any revolutionary spirits desire to have anything new in principle, loyal churchmen will resist the project, for they believe that the old is better.

Now what, in its essential constitution, was the primitive Church? The key to the answer is given in the first Gospel. A careful study of their several works affords the strong presumption, that each Evangelist was supernaturally guided as his special province to emphasize some one particular phase of our blessed Lord's life and office. It fell to the lot of St. Matthew to put before the world the royalty of Christ, and to exhibit the Church, of which He made Himself the Head, under the figure of a kingdom. It is the recognition of this view of the nature of the Church, which has suggested the appropriateness of bringing this subject forward at this season of Advent, when we are reminded so constantly of the coming of the kingdom.

When we open St. Matthew's Gospel we are at once confronted with a long catalogue of names, apparently so uninteresting that the revisers of the Lectionary excluded the recitation of them from the public Lessons. But what are they? A table of royal succession or heirship to the throne of David; and its purpose is, to show that the Founder of the Church drew His human descent from a line of kings. Next we are introduced to a scene, in which the kings of the East are brought, in their

quest for a king, to the cradle at Bethlehem, where they opened their treasures, and presented to the infant Jesus the gold that betokened His royalty. Then follows the picture of the Forerunner, going out into the desert, and proclaiming with a herald's voice the startling message ; "Prepare ye the way of the Lord ;" and why? St. Matthew alone tells us the reason ; because the King is coming ; because "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." In the next chapter we are told—and St. Matthew is the only evangelist who records this particular motive—that the burden of the Lord's own preaching was the echo of the Baptist's : "Repent ; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

After this we come to the first sermon that He preached, "who spake as never man spake," and His opening sentence explains who are the rightful citizens of the kingdom : "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

So, as we read on, in the 13th, 22nd, and 25th chapters, we find a series of parables, in many of which He sets forth the nature of the Church ; and how does He do it? By showing unto what the kingdom of heaven is to be likened. It is impossible to rise from the study of what St. Matthew wrote without a profound conviction that the Church was intended to be far more than an aggregate of believers, or "a congregation of faithful men ;" indeed, nothing less than a kingdom, a kingdom of heaven. The idea runs like a golden thread through the whole gospel from the first page to the last.

If we would grasp what such a figure implies, we must put before our eyes the model of the best earthly kingdom we can find. The king upon his throne is the centre of unity; the sphere of his dominion, large or small, is the boundary of his rule; he has armies to defend the integrity of the empire, or it may be to extend its borders; ministers and ambassadors, with delegated powers, to make known his will and enforce his laws; and subjects bound to their sovereign by ties of fealty and patriotism. In all this there are exact correspondencies in the spiritual kingdom of Christ's Church; but no kingdom of this world can adequately represent it, and for this reason; the Church has for its king One who is God as well as man; His dominions are visible and invisible; His agents not only men but angels, and His subjects the living and the dead—dead at least as man accounts death, but alive unto God—they are partly militant here on earth, partly expectant now in Paradise.

The Church, then, is a kingdom; its rule is regal; but, inasmuch as the Supreme Head of the kingdom is not present in visible form in that part of it which is here on earth, a delegation of authority has become necessary. The delegated authority of the Church on earth is exercised like that of a limited or constitutional monarchy; there is nothing in it despotic or autocratic; and if authority was placed in the first instance in the hands of an aristocracy of rulers, there has always been a distinct recognition of the rights of the democracy.

The highest ministry was the Order of the Apostles,

to whom was committed primarily authority in legislation for the establishment of the Faith, the Worship, and the Discipline of the Church.

First, as regards legislative power generally. It was conveyed when Christ said to them, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."¹ "To bind" and "to loose," were household phrases in the Jewish schools for prohibiting and allowing. We could, without difficulty, produce a hundred instances from the Talmud. Shammai, who represented the old orthodox spirit, vehemently conservative even of the letter of tradition, was marked by his determination to "bind," *i.e.* to impose the severest restrictions. Hillel, his rival, embodied the principles of freedom and laxity; he was, so to speak, the first Liberal in the Jewish polity; and he was characterized by the habit of "loosing." For example, Shammai bound divorce, save for in chastity; Hillel loosed it "for any cause." Further, this commission was given to the Apostles, not as individuals, but as a perpetual corporation, to be continued by a spiritual succession in unbroken line "even unto the end of the world;" so that in all ages Christ the Head should remain in His own Person the source and fountain of all legislation.

The bishops were the heirs of the Apostles; and by their prescriptive right they defined the faith and imposed laws for its proper maintenance.

Again, though we are not told it in so many

¹ St. Matt. xviii. 18.

words, it is commonly believed that having learnt it at the lips of their Lord during the great Forty Days, they drew up the outline of all that was essential for Eucharistic worship. It is the only possible explanation of the phenomena we meet with in the primitive Liturgies. That the control of the forms of worship, or the *jus liturgicum*, was inherited by the episcopate, we have ample proof in this country; we may see it in the later "uses" of the several dioceses.

No one doubts that the Apostles exercised discipline, for the Scriptures prove it; they received authority with "the power of the keys," under a figure, which, like that of binding and loosing, was familiar to Jews, in connexion with the office of stewardship; "The key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open."¹ That was the message which God bade Isaiah deliver to the arrogant Shebna, when He took away his stewardship and gave it to another. History testifies to the same exercise by the hands of the bishops in succeeding ages. They corrected offenders within the pale of the Church by godly admonition, by the withdrawal of spiritual privileges, by enjoining acts of mortification, and, if all these failed, by adopting the extreme measure of exclusion from the Church. In all cases, whether for clergy or laity, the penalties were spiritual, and enforced by ecclesiastical rulers in their spiritual capacity.

¹ Isai. xxii. 22.

Here, then, we see the principle, that authority was to be placed in the first instance in the hands of the few; but the early history of the Church shows that it was only so exercised in certain cases; and it can hardly be supposed that the constituted rulers of the Church would have associated with themselves, as they did, a larger body, unless they had received divine sanction for such a course.

Almost the first thing recorded after the Ascension is that the whole number of disciples selected two candidates for the office vacated by Judas, though the final choice was determined by lot.

Again, at the institution of the diaconate "the whole multitude" chose out seven men, and the Apostles laid hands upon them. We can have no doubt that the final decision really lay with the Apostles, but the faithful laity enjoyed the privilege of the first selection.

In the matter of legislation, it is not easy to decide how far the laity had a voice. The evidence of the Council of Jerusalem, which would naturally determine the question is unfortunately open to ambiguity. The text is obscure, and it is not stated, though some think it to be implied, that the laity took part in the debate. There can be no doubt, however, that at least their consent was obtained to the decrees of the Council; and the Apostolic Fathers support the belief that the Apostles and bishops of the early Church would have hesitated to legislate without the co-operation of the whole body. The action is constantly spoken of as that of "the whole Church."

The same may be said as to the exercise of disciplinary powers. St. Paul acted in conjunction with the faithful laity, when he called upon his converts at Corinth "to put away that wicked person." He seems to have been anxious for it to be felt that they had their part in the exclusion of an unworthy member of the community. This line of action is fully endorsed by what we read in the writings of St. Clement, St. Polycarp and St. Cyprian.

If then, as the terms of their commission seem to imply, the Apostles were made the directly responsible ministers, they were nevertheless careful, while safeguarding their own prerogative, to secure the counsel and co-operation of the laity.¹

Such was the primitive organization and its practical application. But what is the condition of things at the present day? Every province of spiritual authority has been invaded and absolutely controlled by the secular powers. Discipline is in abeyance; worship is regulated by the rigid exactions of the Act of Uniformity; legislation is controlled by Parliament, even worse, it is obstructed by it and made practically impossible.

Now, what is our duty as citizens of a kingdom which is thus thwarted at every step, not only prevented from extending its powers of usefulness, but crippled in the use of those prerogatives which are inherent in its constitution?

¹ The status of the laity is only briefly touched upon here, because it will be fully examined and set forth by other writers, where it forms the specific subject with which they have been appointed to deal.

Surely our first duty, our paramount obligation, is to try to recover the ancient rights of the community so far as our individual efforts can contribute to the recovery.

How, then, is it that the Church has suffered? Can we discover the causes which have entailed the damage or loss? There can hardly be a doubt that in this country the Church has forfeited much of its spiritual authority and independence through its alliance with the State. It is not, however, a necessary consequence; and when the compact was made, it could hardly have been contemplated; but times and circumstances have so changed, that absolute independence could no longer be granted, even if it were claimed, which it is not. What is so much to be wished is, that an alliance, which is presumably beneficial to the State, should not unduly, or more than is imperatively needful, hamper the purely spiritual powers and influence of the Church.

I said that such an alliance carries with it no necessary conflict of authority; and history proves that there was none in the beginning, when Church and State were one; and when every citizen of the secular kingdom was a citizen also of the spiritual, and all worked in harmony together. Indeed, there was so little jealousy, that the State eagerly enlisted the services of ecclesiastical officers for the discharge of civil functions; and the Church gladly accepted the position; but in lapse of time confusion resulted. And this leads us on to show how the disciplinary authority of the Church became weakened and

ultimately fell wholly to pieces. Laws which the Church made as a Church became confounded with those which the Church made in behalf of the State within a certain sphere, which the State remitted to it; and at last discipline, administered through the courts, proved such an intolerable burden that the people revolted against it. Then the State intervened, and took over all disciplinary powers, for the entire community; but in this process the Church's right to exercise discipline over its own members was overlooked.¹

The call comes to us to-day to raise our voices for the recovery and reinforcement of discipline, but discipline according to its original conception; not, as the world believes it is desired, to be used for self-aggrandisement, but as a help which has always been needed, and never more than at the present time, "for the formation of a strong national character."

Time will not allow me to enter upon the second of the Church's invaded rights, or to show how the encroachment has been made upon its control over public worship. I can only just remind you of the stringent restrictions imposed by the State; for by the Act of Uniformity, no change in the Prayer-book, not even the retranslation of a palpable error, can be introduced, without receiving the sanction of a Parliament, which is not, since the abolition of tests, of necessity even Christian.

¹ On the whole of this subject the reader is referred to a speech by the Bishop of London, at the Shrewsbury Congress. Report, p. 362.

Let me turn to the Church's rightful authority, to make laws for its own self-government, in all, that is, which concerns spiritual things. History testifies how all legislative powers resided from the first in the highest ministry of the Church, associating with itself chosen presbyters, at times also consulting with, and strengthened by, the consent of the laity ; but itself initiating, and itself confirming every law. During the great upheaval of ecclesiastical government in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries these powers were largely curtailed ; but, perhaps, they received the severest blow, when in the Georgian era Convocation—older itself than Parliament—was silenced, and not suffered to speak for more than a hundred years. That the Church was to blame for its tacit acquiescence, we have to deplore. It was, we must remember, an age of unparalleled torpor and inactivity ; but the part which the Church was content to play will remain for ever an indelible blot on its history.

But now all this is changed ; the Church has awaked out of sleep, and is panting for larger opportunities to use its God-given strength for the welfare of the nation. It lies with the present generation whether it shall be enabled to do this or not.

And now let me appeal to you as men, who love justice, to see to it, that the kingdom, of which you desire to be loyal citizens, be no longer oppressed by what is really an intolerable wrong. During the last century the Church groaned under the incubus

of a strong Erastianism, which crippled its spiritual independence ; in the present century, it is completely paralyzed, and that by the most determined obstruction. Before, it was only a divided allegiance ; now, it is a whole-hearted hostility. Every attempt at legislation in Parliament is impeded, and that by men, who have not only dissociated themselves from all rights of membership, but who hate its principles, and believe that they see in the rejection of every measure that is proposed for the enlargement of its usefulness the best guarantee for a speedy dislodgement from its national position.

The injustice is even more manifest and glaring, when the legislation which is sought for aims only at the correction of faults. The age in which we live is characterized by its zeal for reform. There is scarcely a secular institution in the land which has not been subjected to the fierce light of a searching criticism, and which, as the natural outcome of the ordeal, has not been at least encouraged, more often compelled, to reform its constitution in all that was proved to be bad or defective. Even so the sacred heritage of the Catholic Church, which has come down to us in this country through all the centuries, is again and again being cast into the self-same crucible, with a view to expose its faults and weaknesses ; but there the parallel ends. The Church alone is denied, and denied by an indifferent and partially hostile Parliament, the only good that can result from examination and exposure. Not till the conscience of the nation is awakened to grasp the

extent of the injustice will the wrong be redressed. And it will never be fully redressed till that is conceded which such a man as Guizot declared to be only a rightful demand : viz. "that the Church in her own sphere should be as free and independent as the State is in hers," or till the first clause of the Magna Charta be again enforced, "that the Church of England shall have its rights whole and its liberties unimpaired."

Now let us see, apart from any influence that we can bring to bear by argument and persuasion, how we can contribute by our individual lives to the improved well-being of the community. If we really wish to see these ideal principles restored in their integrity, we must illustrate their value by a living appreciation of all that they involve ; I mean by a willing obedience to authority, a reverent appreciation of the highest type of worship that we can get, and a ready submission to the discipline, which the Church commends to us, though it cannot enforce. And, what I say concerns the clergy no less than the laity, indeed, in some cases, even more. Are we, then, setting an example of humility and deference to the will and direction of our spiritual rulers ? Is there no truth, as applied to ourselves, in the complaint, too often heard, that their godly admonitions are ignored and their lawful commands set at nought ; that, even within the order of the priesthood, some men are determined to be a law unto themselves, and to do only what is right in their own eyes ? In one word, are we all in a spirit of loyalty and love

showing a due and becoming reverence for those who are set over us in the Lord?

Secondly, what store do we set by the blessings of public worship? Are we using to the full what lies within our reach? For instance, are we yet completely emancipated from that great misconception of its object, which has all too long been drawing people to church only for selfish ends, for what they may learn from the lips of the preacher, or for what they may win from God on their knees in prayer? How few of us have yet grasped the true essential idea of worship as the expression of that homage which is due from the creature to the Creator; that the first great reason why our cathedrals and churches have been built with so much of beauty and splendour is not for the pleasure or admiration or even, except by a reflex influence, for the good of man: not primarily, at least, for praying, nor for preaching, but for praise—for the honour of the great King who deigns now, as of old in the temple, to sit enthroned amidst the praises of His people!

Then, lastly, do we recognize the moral obligation of such discipline as we have? Or do any of us treat such intimations as are left, merely "as harmless survivals of an effete superstition," which may therefore be ignored without any real sacrifice of loyalty to the Church? Let me draw a bow at a venture. The plain directions of our Prayer-book tell us that there is a Table of Vigils, Fasts, and Days of Abstinence to be observed. Every Friday is a day of abstinence. Do we keep it as the discipline of the

Church obliges, not only by abstinence from our ordinary food, but in the spirit of true self-denial by abjuring social gatherings and festal entertainments? How many in such a congregation as this can honestly say that they accept herein the discipline of the Church?

Then one last word on another phase of our duty; as citizens of a kingdom, no man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. We know how the whole nation feels it, even to its remotest corner, if the news ever reaches us, that our soldiers or our sailors have done something to tarnish the national flag or bring discredit on the empire. Live we, then, as men who realize that we are not mere isolated units, whose acts are free and independent, but as men who are banded together to uphold the honour of the kingdom, who know that if one man or woman fail in his or her duty, the whole community is somehow the loser.

Live in the abiding conviction of what our citizenship claims from us in this world; and, then, when our earthly life is closed, it is certain beyond the shadow of a doubt that, if we have shown ourselves worthy of our high calling here, we shall inherit hereafter even a better kingdom, prepared for us "from the foundation of the world." Then, though we may not at once be permitted to behold the beatific vision, that divine consummation to be still delayed till the Church shall have covered the earth as the waters cover the sea—yet, when the archangel goes forth to proclaim the coming of

the King for eternity, for which every Advent message has quickened our expectation, then, at last, we shall behold the King in His beauty, no longer through a glass darkly, no longer hidden beneath material veils—we shall see Him face to face, and go no more out from His presence for evermore.

THE POWER OF THE SPIRIT.

BY THE

REV. A. L. LILLEY, B.A.

“And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand.”—ST. MATT. x. 7.

THIS was to be the burden of the disciples' message when they were sent forth on their great preparatory mission. They were to announce the coming of a kingdom—that is, of a society, which, like every other society, should be founded on definite principles, should have its own definite policy, should grow and develop in the effort to give effect to its policy, should organize itself freely in the spirit of loyalty to the principles which it came to enforce. These are invariable conditions of the existence and the healthy growth of any society. And the kingdom when it came was to be the kingdom of heaven. Its king was to be the King of heaven, the Son of God who was also Son of Man. Its principles were to be the principles of heaven, the love of God and the love of man. Its policy was to be the policy of heaven, the policy of service, not of being ministered unto but of ministering. It was the coming of a

kingdom, and of such a kingdom, that the disciples went forth to herald.

The kingdom did come, and came to grow. It has been growing among men for more than eighteen centuries and a half. And yet, just because it has existed so long, just because its history has been what we know it to have been, many people find it hard to believe that it is the kingdom of God that has been among them at all. They look back on the history of the Church, and they find in it the incidents common to the history of all states. They see rebellions against the King's will of righteousness—like the rebellion of the Italian Renaissance—which were all the more dangerous because they were fostered in its highest places, in its places of rule and guidance. They see the Church harried and persecuted and enslaved, and, worse than all, consenting to be enslaved, by the selfish will of secular princes. They see the Church dragged down by her own leaders into the vortex of territorial struggles. They see her stooping in the persons of her chosen chiefs to the methods of a crooked and cynical diplomacy for the most selfish ends. And, then, as a result of it all, they see her rent into fragments with mutual hatred for their inspiration and mutual anathemas for their creeds. And even when hatred has ceased, and anathemas no longer avail, they see deadness and despair and disbelief in the great ideal of the kingdom settling down upon these disjointed and isolated fragments. Perhaps, after all, it is not wonderful if the plain practical man finds it hard to

believe that the actual Church is Christ's very kingdom of heaven.

And yet even the secular State, that has in it a real living principle, that has the spirit of nationality, survives vicissitudes that look like death or decay. It survives rebellions and the paralysis that comes from tyranny and external conquest and internal disruption. For fourteen hundred years Italy was a prey to strife within and conquest from without. All that time political geography knew nothing of Italy ; and yet she was alive all the time. She felt in herself the unity of a single life as against the outer barbarian ; and the outer barbarian felt too that as against him all her cities were athrob with a single spirit. And in our own day she has at last turned that unity that was all the time working underneath the surface—that uttered itself in a common art and a common literature and, above all, in a common national hope—into visible fact.

It is exactly so with the Church. The real history of the Church is not that which is written large upon the surface. Her real history is hidden away in the hearts of her simple pious children, who, at the darkest moment of her history, still believed that her Lord was the Lord of heaven, and that her abiding principles were the principles of heaven, and who still strove to be true to that Lord and to those principles. That is the spirit that nothing has availed to kill out of the Church, and it is in virtue of that spirit that she still lives in spite of all her failures and all her divisions. It is in virtue of that spirit

that her children are at last beginning consciously to hope and to work for the time when her unity may be again a visible fact.

But I know that some people look upon belief in the Church as a kind of graceful addition to the sum of Christian belief—at any rate, as not of the essence of that belief. It is not so. Jesus Christ would not have founded the kingdom of heaven if it had not been a spiritual necessity. And, surely, when we think of what religion is, we must see that for us too, here and now, the Church is a spiritual necessity of our Christianity. If religion were only the getting of something from God which we might keep for ourselves, then, perhaps, it might be a matter between our individual selves and God alone. But nothing that we get from God can be of any use to us if we try to keep it all for ourselves. God can only give us His own power, what we call His Spirit, and His Spirit is a living power of love and of service. Wherever God's Spirit is, He is always working in one way. He is always serving, helping, uplifting, redeeming. Whether God's Spirit is acting directly or indirectly through men, He is always doing the same thing. God gives His power to men only that they may give it out again to one another. And nothing binds men together like the spirit of service. To serve another is the surest way of getting to love another, to understand him, to become in some sense one with him. It was Machiavelli, the shrewdest and least idealist of observers of human nature, who said, "Such is the nature of men that they become as

strongly attached to others by the benefits they render as by the favours they receive." Besides, all service is stunted and weak while it stands alone. Men feel instinctively that they cannot do all they might till they join themselves to others who have the same desires and the same aims as themselves. It is face to face with the claims of human need that men have always learned the truth of that fact of experience which is suggested in Rossetti's line—"Are not two prayers a perfect strength?" Service is the secret of all the lasting societies in the world. They have all been the outcome of a common faith and a common hope, inspiring men to inevitable union in a common service. So Christianity, the divine spirit of service, the spirit of Jesus Christ working in this world, had to exist in and through a society. The Church is no accidental addition to Christianity. It is a spiritual necessity of its distinctive character.

Such, then, is the connection of churchmanship in its widest and only true sense with Christianity. They are really one and the same. As Christians we are and must be churchmen, citizens of the kingdom of God. That means that the Holy Spirit, when He makes a man consciously a Christian, when He touches his life with the passion and the power of goodness, has not come forth as it were from the heavens on a special mission to that man's individual soul, but that He has been always working silently, patiently, on the humanity of which he is a fragment, working upon the heredity out of which he has come, working upon

the environment by which he is so largely determined, working in the tradition which has moulded his thought, and so working in his own natural and instinctive power of thought and motive and will ; and that he is consciously a Christian just when he makes conscious response to the unwearying action of the Spirit upon him. And it means also that his effect upon the world through living in the Spirit, his share in building up the kingdom of heaven, in making its principles prevail over wider and wider areas and with ever surer and more searching power, is the final and the only trustworthy test of his Christianity. It means, in short, that every power of God within us has come to us through our union with others, and that every judgment of God about us is determined by the influence which by being what we are we have consciously or unconsciously exercised upon the lives of others.

This is the ground on which I desire to place the practical question of Church Reform here in England to-day—the only safe ground on which it can be placed, and on which at all moments of the Church's history it needs to be placed. As Christians we are citizens of the Church. We can only do Christ's work through that citizenship. We are responsible for keeping her eternal principles always to the front in all fields of human activity. We are responsible for determining her policy, for deciding how in every fresh emergency she may best serve the true needs of men. We are responsible for keeping her pure in her methods and unselfish in her aims. That is the

end of all church organization. To organize the Church here or elsewhere with a view to her aggrandisement as a mere institution among many rivals would be an iniquity. To organize her with a view to making her a more effective instrument of God's righteousness is, at all times, the greatest and most constraining of necessities. And if this is to be done among us now, the universal Christian conscience of our country must be stung into activity. The Christians of England must be made to feel that, if the Church among us seems to have compromised her high mission in mere religious respectability, or to have confined it within the pale of ecclesiastical exclusiveness, it is at least partly their fault. It is because they have denied or forgotten what true churchmanship is. Out of mere loyalty to Christ, the laity of England must come forth and reclaim their heritage. We must remember what the kingdom is, and that we are all alike its citizens, and we must act together in loyalty to its principles. That is the one hope of safe and efficient Church Reform.

There are, then, just two things which we must all keep in mind in embarking upon this great enterprise. First, we have all alike a right to a share in the shaping of the Church's counsels, simply because we are all responsible to Christ the King for her work being done, simply because we are all citizens of the kingdom. And it is our paramount duty to claim that right and to accept that responsibility.

And, secondly, we cannot be true to this Church of England unless we are true, first of all, to that

universal Church which is being built up by the Spirit of Christ throughout all the ages in the length and breadth of Christendom. It is because the Spirit of Christ is working everywhere that He is working here. The organization of the Church may be different, perhaps, must be different, among peoples of differing character and tradition. But the Spirit through which it works, and the work which it has to do, are always and everywhere the same. And we cannot reform the organization of the Church in England to-day, unless we keep constantly in mind the Church's universal and eternal aim. Dante was a good Florentine and a loyal Florentine reformer because he believed in the Italy which the ordinary statesman of his time—Guelph or Ghibelline—regarded as a futile dream. And we shall be good English Churchmen and wise English Church reformers only if we really believe in that city of God which is being built up on earth, of which our Church is but a distant ward.

CHURCH AND NATION.

BY THE

REV. C. E. OSBORNE, B.A.

“And Jesus went into the temple of God.”—ST. MATT. xxi. 12.

THERE is a profound misconception with regard to the attitude of the great prophets and reformers of the Jewish Church towards the religion of Israel, and, indeed, with regard to the attitude of Jesus Christ Himself towards the organized Church of His day, which at the outset we need to clear away.

It is an attractive, but at the same time superficial, view of the religion of the Bible which represents the ecclesiastical history of Israel as the record of a struggle between two contending parties; on the one hand, the party of form and order, whose tendency was to organize religion until at last, swathed in formulas and buried beneath external observances, its true spirit expired, slain by pedantry and sacerdotalism; and, on the other hand, as opposed to this school of clerical formality and of minute regulations, those whose mission it was to proclaim the message of the essential spirituality of religion, its subjectivity, its freedom, and its independence

of form. According to this view, there was, on the one hand, the church party, the party of religious machinery, ever seeking to organize under visible form the energies of the spiritual world; and, on the other hand, the prophetic order, with Jesus Christ as the culmination of it, the natural antagonists of the priesthood, the inspired exponents of a free religion and an invisible Church, the witnesses that the social organization of revealed religion as an ordered *Ecclesia* is a process which is a practical denial of the range, variety, and liberty of the operations of the Spirit of God upon the mind of man.

There is, of course, a considerable amount of truth implicitly contained in the attitude of those who urge this view of the history of the Jewish Church; but when it is presented as the obvious explanation of the condition of mind exhibited by our Lord when He cleansed the polluted sanctuary of His Father, the view in question is open to the objection that it ignores some of the most striking features in that anger of Christ of which the Temple cleansing was the outcome and expression. It is, after all, but a shallow, although a picturesque, explanation of Christ's judicial anger against the money-changers, to say that it arose from an aversion to the temple, from a consciousness of the contrast between its ecclesiastical gloom and the sunlight on the Galilean hills, between a religion of routine and organization and a religion of instinct and expansion, between church walls and the open sky of nature's temple, between the bondage of the letter that killeth and the freedom

of the spirit of life. To such a statement, presented as it is by a brilliant French critic of the New Testament as the simplest explanation of the wrath of the Messiah with the ministers of His courts, the words of Jeremiah, with which the Prophet of Galilee drives home His condemnation, furnish a sufficient answer. It is because it is "His Father's house" that Christ says the temple must be cleansed. He is indicating its true dignity as the pledged meeting-place of God with His people; He is asserting its character as a home for man's spirit, and as being as true a scene of the manifestation of the glory of His Father, in the order of grace, as, in the order of nature, were the quiet hills by Nazareth or the shores of the Galilean lake. For man is moulded of matter and spirit, he requires the localization of the Divine; and the religion of Jesus Christ is no vague ideal hanging in mid-air, as it were, but rather an incarnation and an embodiment, "a city that hath foundations," its plan in heaven, its structure on earth; therefore, since the revelation of the Infinite clothes itself under finite form, Jesus Christ loved the temple of God, and because He loved it, or rather the truth it represented (*i.e.* the life of the Divine Society, as His own kingdom and the family of His Father), He was determined that it should be cleansed.

The same forces that we see at work in every great crisis of the Church's history were at work in and around Israel on the day when Christ made His judicial entry into the temple of God. There were the enemies and the critics of the Church without,

and the defenders and maintainers of the Church within. Without were the Roman imperialism, the philosophers, and the heathen peoples, and to these Judaism presented itself either as a religion of bigotry, inconsistent with clear reasoning, or as a religion of gloom, casting a shadow, as far as its influence extended, over the employments and the pleasures of mankind. As against the world of speculative thought or of materialist business and enjoyment stood the Jewish Church, itself filled with the spirit of the world, and yet boasting itself as the world's antagonist, identifying its own interests as the elect church-nation with the interests of spiritual revelation and of moral truth, and yet defending itself, not by the exhibition of a life of righteousness, but rather by the mere force of resistance to and isolation from the hostile influences which threatened its existence.

At such a crisis our blessed Lord came "suddenly," as the prophet had foretold, as the true cleanser of His temple, the true defender of His Church; and He came so to cleanse it that it might not need defence, but that the Church, breaking forth on all sides from the fortress walls of Judaism, which had at once protected and confined her, should "inhabit the waste places," and, by her own spiritual beauty, the reflection of her divine ideal, should appeal to all "men of good will" with an irresistible invitation.

In preaching to you to-day for the Church Reform League, I have been asked to make known more clearly to those who have not already considered the

subject, not so much proposed details of any scheme of reformation, but rather the great general principles which must underlie all church-life and citizenship in the kingdom of God. I speak to-day as a churchman to churchmen and churchwomen. I come from a parish in the centre of the coalpits of Northumberland to speak to you whose life-work lies in this great mother city of London. Our fellow-membership in the Church of God and in our English branch of it, our common belief in the Catholic Church as a visible organism rather than an invisible abstraction, our common conviction that, in spite of all sins, failures, and shortcomings, the Church of England is no sect upheaved into existence amid the theological turmoil of the sixteenth century, but the genuine representative and continuation of the Church of Aidan and of Augustine, of Anselm and of Langton, all this supplies the element of sympathy between preacher and hearers, without which these Church Reform Sermons will be mere profitless essays. For we, as loyal members of the Church of England, desire her reform for the very reason that we believe in her capacities. It is because we feel that she has been in the past the spiritual mother of the nation, that we feel that she must aim at the realization of no low ideal in the present and for the future, and that the roots of every genuine movement for reformation within her must grow out of that soil of the great principle of spiritual citizenship, without the recognition of which the Church of Christ shrinks into a State department, or evaporates into a philosophical theory.

For, after all, the idealists are in the long run the really practical people, and if you want to win even the average man to believe in the utility of any great institution, it is necessary to go down to the root and foundation of the social life of which the institution is the instrument and the expression. So it is that in order to make the Church more efficient and useful in her ministry of human service, we must first realize our membership in her as "citizens of no mean city," as subjects of the visible kingdom of Jesus Christ.

It is often said that Englishmen are religiously minded, but are not ecclesiastically minded. This statement is the commonplace of those who dislike alike secularism and dogma, and who consider that in regard to education Christianity can be best presented under the form of sentiment rather than of creed. If such a statement means that the average well-intentioned Englishman has a natural dislike of "clericalism," and a preference for "applied" rather than academic Christianity, all who believe that the human side of the religion of the Incarnation needs the fullest proclamation will find in it but little cause for depression. But if it means that the conception of Christianity in the minds of the majority of our fellow-countrymen is of such a vague description that it finds within it no place for the idea that Jesus Christ has founded a visible and organic society, it is plain that such a view is a misconception which can be adequately met, not by controversial methods, but only by exhibiting the life of the Church to-day as

that of co-operation and citizenship, and by making the Church of England through such a manifestation a self-evident witness of the truth of her claims to be the Church not merely of a class but of the nation, the Church of the English people, because she is the national part of the world-wide Ecclesia of the imperial Christ.

The truth is that, for many religious English people, the instinct of citizenship, however quickened and satisfied in the life and service of the State, has too often remained a secular instinct, outside the range of distinctly religious motives, and finding within the sphere of the distinctively Christian life but little of consecration, of incentive, and of satisfaction. The man with strong social instincts and the powers of a master-builder, or at least of a skilled labourer, in the life of citizenship finds a large outcome for his powers in the service of the State or in municipal life, and thinks (or, at least, so thought till lately) mainly of Christianity as concerned with his individual salvation.

Such a man might, indeed, find distinctively Christian expression for the instincts of corporate life in some of the great philanthropic institutions and movements, which inevitably spring from Christian faith and the regard for human well-being, but seldom in the Christian Society itself, which indeed was conceived at best as a mechanism rather than an organism, as a contrivance rather than a life, as a collection of "Bible Societies" rather than as the Body of Christ.

Now we, as churchmen, must aim at realizing our citizenship in the *Civitas Dei*, at making that citizenship a fact and not only an ideal, because we believe that Jesus Christ came not merely to inspire a book, but to found a kingdom. We, as baptized members of the Church, must claim the rights of our citizenship, and, at the same time, recognize its responsibilities and obligations, because we are profoundly dissatisfied with the religious individualism which has dropped out of sight the inspiring truth of the visible Ecclesia. We claim our membership in that Ecclesia, that Body of Christ, because we believe, with all the force alike of intellectual conviction and of loyalty to our Master's promises, that the Church which He has founded is by its very nature visible and tangible, touching human life at every point, influencing art, literature, science, politics, social intercourse, as well as the more directly moral and spiritual departments of human existence, and yet ever distinct from, even while mingling with, the various forms of secular activity by which she is surrounded.

Any belief in the Church, that rises above a merely political regard for her condition as a State Establishment, involves necessarily a heightened sense of the importance and responsibility of her citizenship and her franchise, and of the necessity of such reform as shall make her corporate life as a self-governing, or rather Christ-governed, body a distinct and appreciable reality in the England of to-day.

The weakness of Puritanism lies in its conception of Christianity as exclusively spiritual; the

invisible Church of the elect, or the truly converted, taking the place of the Catholic Community of the baptized, consolidated by the central social sacrament of Eucharistic worship and Communion. Yet on the other hand, we have in regaining the exercise of our church citizenship to guard against the opposite or Erastian error which regards the Society of Christ as entirely visible in the most earthly sense, but without distinctness of outline apart from the life of the secular State, of which it is at once a part and an expression.

If the tendency of the Evangelical school of thought and piety in the past has been to lose hold theologically upon that view of the Church, which presents her as the "extension of the Incarnation," the social body of the Christ, human, visible, organic, and tangible, all churchmen alike have fallen from their ideal in allowing one after another of the Church's most undoubted prerogatives to be appropriated by the State and merged amid its powers, until at last the ordinary Englishman finds great difficulty in realizing the distinctness of the Church, as apart from its condition as the counterpart and expression of the State in spiritual things. Do we not see the effect of this in regard to the vital question of Christian marriage? The idea that the Church can have a law on the subject of marriage and divorce, which should be capable at any point of exhibiting divergence from the law of the State; that the clergy of the Church are bound, in regard to solemnizing the marriage rites of her members,

to obey the Church's law rather than the State's law ; that ultimately we are to ask not what is the mind of the majority of the community or of the average good-natured man, but what has Jesus Christ laid down as the great moral foundation for the life of the Christian family ;—these are ideas which are hard for many Englishmen to grasp, or even to apprehend. The reason of this is that they are essentially ideas which arise from the conception of a kingdom founded by Jesus Christ, a kingdom distinct from the nations with which its life is interpenetrated, and a kingdom which, while prohibited by its founder from invading the legitimate functions of the civil power, is yet, within the spiritual and moral region, supreme and independent under Christ as its Head, and His Spirit as its teacher and its energy.

This idea we Anglican church-people have been in great danger of losing for the sake of peace and quietness, of avoiding collision with the State, and of rousing into life, whether as our friend or our antagonist, that force which may be considered either as fanaticism or enthusiasm, either as the temper of the bigot or of the idealist, according to the point of view from which we regard it. Nor is it alone the dread of kindling the flames of an irresponsible zeal which has led to our timid acquiescence in the gradual absorption into the province of the Civil Power of the Church's inherent rights to self-government and corporate expression. We, as Anglicans, have been largely deterred from definite measures of church reform by the influence of the

Elizabethan conception of the nature of the alliance between Church and State as that of the unity of what is practically one organism, all members of the State being necessarily members of the national Church. This idea was indeed manifestly contradicted by the logic of facts, yet its prevalence was perfectly natural under the conditions of the Tudor monarchy. Nor is such a conception of a great church-nation without a robust grandeur of its own, which marks it as standing on a higher level than the base Erastianism of the eighteenth-century politicians, and as presenting an appeal to the imagination which the latter system, with its timid earthliness, is incapable of making.

Let us be quite sure, therefore, that it is from no inadequate appreciation of the office and functions of the State, that we claim to accentuate the distinctness of the Church's life, and in the last resort her inherent right to regulate in her own way all questions internal to her life as a society, and to exercise unhindered her office as spiritual teacher and guide of the souls and consciences of her members. If an increasing number of thoughtful churchmen are claiming for the Church the regaining of her lost heritage, and the recovery of her right to govern herself in spiritual things, they are none the less learning to realize that the State is also, within its own sphere, the ordained minister of God (Rom. xiii. 4). We have learnt, or are learning, mainly from the teaching of that true prophet, Frederic Denison Maurice, that while the Church is in a special sense

the kingdom of Christ, the appointed sphere within which His saving activities are pledged and certified to His people, yet we must not dare to say of a thing so divinely instituted as the life of the nation that it is common or unclean, that we must recognize marks of divinity stamped on every true and necessary form of human existence, and perceive working through the Family and the State, as well as through the Church, the operations of the living God, of whose will all social as well as individual growth and progress is the outcome and manifestation. The principle, however, on which our church-membership is based is that of the distinct character of the Church as the society of Jesus Christ, and of the Church of England as the national branch of the historical catholic community which is continuous from the upper chamber of Pentecost. While we recognize the life of the State as supreme under God within its own sphere, "the minister of God for good" to us in matters political and secular, yet we must maintain that there is also in the life of the Church a sphere larger, wider, more elastic than that of the State; while at the same time the influences at work within it are more penetrative and profound in their relations to man's moral and spiritual needs, and as a consequence to his social nature as well.

For if we value and claim our citizenship in the Church, and desire to use it as a means to free her from all that hinders the fulfilment of her divine mission, it is because for us the scriptural conception of the Church is essentially that of a power let down from

heaven, as the draw-net of the Master's parable, let down from a higher and purer region into this mixed world in which, as in a troubled sea, it is to move apparently at the mercy of every varying current, while it enfolds within its meshes all kinds and conditions of men. We admit the Church to be a society so human, so large, so wide in its embrace, including within it so many things that are evil and unspiritual, like the grotesque sea-creatures which, mingled with the wholesome fish, are swept along indiscriminately by the net let down into the waters, that it seems at times so un-divine a system that men doubt if it can be the Church of God at all. The Puritan stands aside and says, "This earthly thing so marked with human passion and infirmity, so manipulated at the bidding of selfish interests and swayed by worldly aims, is wholly of this lower world, it has no affinity with the Jerusalem, which descended out of heaven from God." Yet we as church-people say still, "It is the city of God, the Jerusalem built in earth's green and pleasant fields;" and we dare to recognize in the Catholic Church, rent and divided as she is, that which is the pledge and the prophecy of the kingdom of God, that which in spite of all imperfections realizes that kingdom in partial measure, and is herself the instrument and foretaste of ever wider realizations of it.

But how, it may be said, does this concern the practical question of Church Reform in the Church of England of to-day? I answer to this that our first work must be to understand rightly the principles

on which reform is to be based. In order to do this we must realize the existence, nature, and powers of the Church, and of our own branch of the Church, as a true part of the great organism on which holy Scripture, waiting as it were by its cradle, bestows the title of the Body of Christ. In other words, we must realize that membership in the Church means membership in the Sacraments, and that it is membership in the life of a visible and social corporation, growing and developing through the ages, and yet distinct from, while intermingled with, the various forms of political and civic existence with which it comes into continual and closest contact.

What, then, is the first thing we have to do, in regaining for the Church her lost right of self-government? It is *to disestablish the ratepayer*, and to secure that no mere property qualification shall be the test of capacity to sit in any church assembly as laymen, from such bodies as parochial church councils upward ; that no persons who are not *bonâ fide* members of the Church of England shall have any voice in the management of her affairs ; and that, on the other hand, all actual members of the Church shall have, by virtue of their membership, the right of exercise of a true franchise however guarded from abuse in the election of her officers, and of a voice in the settlement of all matters which are not by Scripture and by the principles of the universal Church restricted to the office of the ordained ministry of Christ. Further, we must face the fact that the Parliament of to-day is a very different assembly to that of

Tudor times, and that the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical was never intended to be exercised by a prime minister, representing persons of every religious opinion and of none. For however hostile to church principles, or ignorant of them, many of the members of the Reformation and Stuart Parliaments may have been, they were at least persons who professed to be members of the Church of England; nor was their power of legislating in church matters left undisputed, whether by the crown as "supreme governor" of the Church, or by the clergy as represented by the as yet unsuppressed Convocation, a body far more really representative than now of the whole body of the clergy. But we must be prepared to go behind the Tudor Reformation if we are to arrive at the principles on which reform to be lasting must be based. We must go back to the witness of the New Testament (the earliest church history) and of the records of the Church of the first days. When we do so, we find that, just as in political development, the oldest institutions are often the freest and the most conservative in point of time are the most liberal in principle; that, as in English history constitutional liberty was anticipated in the earlier proceedings of Parliament, to be afterwards obscured under the personal rule of the new monarchy, so also the Catholic Church possessed at the first a democratic side to her constitution, which was manifested most conspicuously, though not exclusively, in the popular election of bishops, and is seen in the Church's infancy in the choice by the "whole multitude"

of the persons to be presented to the Apostles for ordination as deacons. Nor is there any need to fear the revival of the Church's democratic aspect, provided such revival be accompanied by a firm grasp of the principle of sacramental membership. The share of the "plebs" in the Church's organized life, which was the outcome of faith in the universal priesthood of baptized believers, was obscured in theory, and well-nigh lost in practice, by the rise of the Byzantine conception in the East and of the Papal in the West—the Pope of "old Rome" and the Cæsar of "new Rome" investing the Latin and Eastern confederations of churches, respectively, with an imperial and monarchical character, the effect of which was to absorb the original elective and other rights of the entire body of the laity.

In England, when the national Church in the sixteenth century was severed, by agents in many cases very unworthy, from the Latin ecclesiastical system, her dependence upon the civil power was inevitably accentuated and exaggerated. As then the Church was extricated, or extricated herself, from her connection with the papal monarchy, so now it may well be that she is on the eve of a new era in her existence, and that a similar repudiation will take place, *i.e.* of the claim of the State to legislate for her in matters which lie within her own spiritual sphere. Humanly speaking, it rests with us, as churchmen, whether such a movement towards which we seem to be tending, shall assume the character of an evolution from within, and shall succeed in

preserving all that is requisite for the Church's continuous life and fruitful service, while discarding those remnants of Tudor despotism, which, however overruled for good in the past, are totally unsuited to the new needs of the England of to-day. If history has its warnings, it also has its encouragements. When we read the story of the Tudor time, as modern historical research unfolds it for us, we find some good men eager for religious revolution, others, equally sincere, fighting against inevitable change, and discerning thinkers feeling that they are on the verge of some dimly perceived development, which they approach either with caution or with hope, with fear or with welcome. Yet looking back we can see that through all God was working out His own plan, calling England to a wider life, overruling for ultimate good the headstrong will and merciless lusts of Henry VIII., the weakness of Edward VI., the bigotry of Mary, the state-craft of Elizabeth, and through it all fulfilling to England's Church and Nation the promise of all those times when the forces of new and old wrestle together, "Thine heart shall fear, and be enlarged."

So to-day, under more peaceful and humane conditions of thought and life, our Church is called, by the circumstances of the age in which she finds herself, to learn the meaning of the same prophetic word, to learn that progress—not stagnation—is the law of life, and that just as she learned in the sixteenth century to dis sever the essential elements of her existence from the theory of the papal monarchy

(the great ideal which found in a Hildebrand or an Innocent III., the instruments of its practical realization), so also she must face with hope and courage the calls and opportunities of an age the furthest removed in its character of any since the Tudor period from that practical identification of Church and State, which was natural to such a thinker as Hooker, living in the England of Elizabeth, and so practically impossible, in spite of the advocacy of the noble-minded Arnold, to the churchman of to-day.

Let us, therefore, as citizens of that part of God's City in which His providence has placed us, strive not to earn for ourselves the right to be justly taunted as *semper pavidī*. Great calls summon us to set our house in order; the sounds of change are around us everywhere; every part of the universal Church is awakening from lethargic contentment with existing conditions. The aspirations for reunion which meet us on all sides, the weariness with the ancient commonplaces of controversial strife,—these things are as evident on the one hand, as the conviction that the age needs vital Christianity, and that mere religious individualism is insufficient to supply that need, is on the other. The Church is the instrument to cleanse the world, let us see to it that the instrument itself is clean. Let us, the members of this League, and those who sympathize with its objects, "keep not silence, and give the Lord no rest, until He make Jerusalem a praise and a glory in the earth."

For if the Church fails to-day, will it not be because

we, as individual members, have failed to recognize the greatness of the call, the splendour of the opportunity, the "height of His Will"?

"Behold, I set before thee an open door;" it is the door of God-given opportunity. Let the unconscious cry for the gospel that goes up from the midst of this restless age, let the call to the Church to say if she has any living message for the world, send us to the foot of the cross, to rise from thence with purged characters, with braced wills, with faithful insight, cleansed as individuals, cleansed as a Church, that we may hear Christ's voice calling us to survey wider ranges of truth and to contend on new battle-fields of action, and that as we hear, we may follow and obey.

SPIRITUAL AND SECULAR.

BY THE

REV. W. E. COLLINS, M.A.

“The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ ; and he shall reign for ever and ever.”—REV. xi. 15.

IN the Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ a new power has come into the world, the like of which was unknown before. New aims and aspirations are set before men ; new power is imparted to them to fulfil those aims and to attain to those aspirations.

But if this were all, our faith would not be what it is. If Christianity simply opened new regions of life and thought to men, if it simply directed them into new channels of life, and enabled them to live in these, it would still be a partial thing, like in kind to any other great discovery, though greater in degree.

But it has done more than this. Not only are there new things in the world, but all things are made new. The Faith is not simply something superadded to what was in the world before ; it interprets the whole of life to us, and gives it a new meaning throughout ; it supplies a new motive-power

for all our efforts, and gives to them a new and a true direction ; it interprets and combines the fragmentary aspirations of all hearts, and provides for the satisfaction of them. As Christians we are here to claim the whole range of being as belonging by right to our Lord ; to vindicate the divine nobleness of all callings and the potential holiness of all existence. We are here to proclaim Him, and sing praise to Him, as King over the whole earth ; not to make Him King, for that He is already—King of kings and Lord of lords.

“The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.” St. John the Divine is speaking of the completed work, when the seventh angel shall have sounded his trumpet, and the day of the Lord shall be at hand. But St. John never deals with the future only, or rather he transcends altogether both time and all finite things ; for he has attained to that divine insight which sees things as they are. To all who can understand he speaks of things past and things present as well as things to come. He sees, and would teach everybody who has eyes to see, that the kingdoms of this world are already the kingdoms of his Lord. His, because the whole universe was made in Him at the beginning ; His, because He bought them with a price when He came into the world ; His, because again and again, in every “coming” of His into the world in the course of human history, He vindicates them for Himself ; His, because in the judgment of the last great day the King will claim His own.

Already, I say, we may see this if we will. The powers of evil seem indeed to be as strong as ever, and never was their power more clearly visible than to-day in the affairs of nations. But nobody who studies the matter with adequate knowledge can fail to see that although in any individual age the warfare is as fierce as ever, and perhaps even more terrible, yet the Christian elements in the State and in all secular life are growing, not because of us, but in spite of us. Those elements which are least righteous in the long run fall and perish, and by a kind of natural selection those survive which are most fit to survive. That the kingdoms of the world are becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ, is therefore not a theory or a dream, but a fact of experience.

If then we are to dwell for a time upon the right government of the Church, the spiritual kingdom, and especially of the relations of the spiritual and temporal elements, which is the subject apportioned to me, we can only do so profitably by recognizing this fact fully and freely. The secular and spiritual elements are not to be regarded as opposed to one another, but as alike divine. If the one may be perverted and degraded, so assuredly may the other. But still, although they are of different orders, each is in its essential nature a good thing, and each works for good with the other.

The Church has therefore at all times a twofold duty ; she has to recognize the claims of the spiritual and temporal alike. She has to teach men to perform

well the duties both of this world and the world to come : to make them good citizens both of the State to which they belong and of the City which hath the foundations. She has to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.

And these are not two opposing duties, but one and the same. To render to God all that is His, is the only way of doing lasting service to Cæsar ; for so only can the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ. To render unto Cæsar that which is his by right, is part of our duty to God ; to render to Cæsar that which is not his, is to fail of our duty to God. They are not, therefore, two opposing claims between which some compromise must be made. The State is not an enemy that must be faced, but is working in the same direction as the Church is, though in a different order of life.

But nevertheless, so long as the Church is militant here on earth, so long as she is still on her pilgrimage and compassed about with human infirmity, so long will the difficulty remain of satisfying alike the claims of the spiritual and the secular. For, as it has been well said,¹ "The attempt to draw an unwavering line between 'spiritual' and 'temporal' affairs is an attempt to achieve the impossible ;" and this is so simply because religious and civil societies interpenetrate one another at every point.² The difficulty

¹ By Professor Maitland, in "The English Historical Review" for Oct., 1896, p. 644.

² Cf. Ad. Franck, *Philosophie du Droit Ecclésiastique*, p. 2 : "Deux

is not one which is peculiar to any one age ; and the solution that would have satisfied one age certainly would not have satisfied another. Nor does it arise from the particular relations subsisting between Church and State ; sooner or later the questions must arise whatever these relations may be. And although, no doubt, the actual points in dispute in the case of disestablishment would be other than they are at the present day, yet a disestablished Church would have to face questions not really different in kind. The difficulty, in other words, is inherent ; it arises as soon as there is a Church at all. How far do the rights of the secular power extend for us ? How much are we to render to Cæsar ? What are the things that are Cæsar's ? There it is at once ; and it is really vital. It came to the front in the days of the Apostles, when the commandment went forth that they were to preach no more in the name of Jesus. It was to be found in the Church of the Catacombs, when it had to be settled how far Christian people might lawfully conform to the idolatrous or half-idolatrous customs which were ingrained in the political world of which they formed part. It arose again, and in a more subtle form, when Christianity became the religion of the empire under Constantine, and the Church had to decide how much deference was to be paid to the authority which now brought them life instead

sociétés qui non-seulement se touchent, mais qui se pénètrent dans toutes leurs parties et qui demeurent cependant distinctes par leur nature, quelque effort que l'on fasse pour les confondre."

of death. And the case has really been the same ever since—as it must always be—not only with the Church, but with every other religious or quasi-religious body, Christian or non-Christian, provided that it recognizes the State as a good thing at all, and does not start with the assumption that the powers that be were made to be disobeyed. For, with even the smallest and least organized society, there is usually something of the nature of common property or covenanted relationship between the members, even if there be neither trust deeds nor endowments; and the State claims the supervisory regulation of all these.¹ And on the other hand, if there has grown up that more or less intimate relationship between Church and State, mainly for the purposes and the benefit of the latter, which we commonly call establishment,² the questions which arise differ in degree only, not in kind. The State allows certain privileges to the Church, which involve corresponding disabilities and restraints; but

¹ Cf. Haddan, *Apostolical Succession in the Church of England*, p. 297: "The Queen is supreme governor over *all* persons, and therefore over Dissenters and Romanists as well as ourselves. And this means, in their case as well as ours, that legal tribunals will settle all questions in any way involving civil rights, as for us, so for them also. Those tribunals have, in fact, done so repeatedly already; and it is quite right they should. They have discussed Baptist doctrine, for instance, apropos to the (Baptist) orthodoxy of a Baptist minister, and to his consequent retention of an endowment or a salary."

² It may not be amiss to remind ourselves that this much misused word does not denote anything more than *strengthening* or the like, as in the title of Defoe's famous pamphlet, "The Shortest Way with the Dissenters; or, Proposals for the Establishment of the Church."

they create no new relationship ; and the problem of harmonizing the spiritual and secular elements in church government, the relations between religion and the State, is in its essence that which was there from the beginning.

We, at the present day, however, have to face it in a very complex form. We live in an age in which, as it has been said, the sphere of the Church might seem to be constantly growing narrower, and that of the State constantly growing wider. There was a time when education and art, medicine and law, the care of the poor and the stranger, to say nothing of road-making and bridge-building, were almost entirely done through the agency of the Church, simply because nobody else cared to do them. Each of these has now passed more or less from her own hands into those of the world at large ; for so far, at any rate, the world is doing the Church's work, and its kingdoms have become the kingdoms of the Christ. And on the other hand, everything in men's lives has been brought within the sphere of State activity ; and matters which formerly interested it little, or not at all, are now under its control for good or for evil, and in general undoubtedly for good. Consequently, in spite of the fact that the Church no longer works in her corporate capacity in many spheres which were once hers, all church life still has what has now come to be regarded as a strongly secular side.

The canonical action of the Church, just like that of any other body with 'bye-laws' of its own, involves

consequences of a secular character, and often of the most far-reaching kind. The endowments of the Church, though not large in proportion to the demands made upon them, are yet such as to call for special treatment at the hands of the secular power ; just as in our own day many other questions affecting private property have come under State control. Our bishops again, or some of them, are also lords of parliament, and are hedged about with no little secular dignity. Our clergy are in some ways privileged, and in others subject to disabilities. Our elementary schools are of necessity in receipt of a State subsidy, since the exigencies of competition render any other system impossible. As regards marriage, our clergy are in the position of civil registrars, and are performing functions at once civil and spiritual in every marriage that they solemnize. And even as regards the burial of the dead, burial in consecrated ground is in the eye of the law a different thing from burial in unconsecrated.

How then is the Church of Christ in this land to preserve the harmony of the spiritual and the secular ? What is our proper attitude in the face of things such as these ? We have indeed to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's ; but we have to bear in mind that his is not the primary claim upon us. To give to Cæsar that which was not his, would be to rob God ; and, at the same time, it would be doing a great wrong to Cæsar. For, as I have said, by deferring to the civil power in spiritual matters we should be so far hindering the growth of

the kingdoms of this world into that which they are destined to become.

In other words, if it should be necessary to choose between them, we must needs choose as the Apostles did. We must obey God rather than man. Surely, here is the real and the final test of a Christian's duty. We can only realize our citizenship in this earthly kingdom in so far as it has become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ. We ought to face the matter definitely: if in our day the civil power makes demands which we believe to be contrary to the Christian law, we can but obey God, and willingly accept the consequences of our action.

To apply this to some of the things of which I have spoken. (a) The legislative power of the English Church, is, at the present time, limited by the need for the assent of the civil power; or rather, more accurately, the legislation of the Church is civilly inoperative until it has received such sanction. This is a reasonable proviso; for every legislative act of the Church has a scope in matters temporal which is more far-reaching than we easily realize. But if at any time difficulties should be put in the way of necessary church legislation, it might be our duty to weigh the evil so caused against the evil which would accrue to the State, *i.e.* to ourselves and our brethren, by disestablishment, and then to act accordingly. (b) Or again, with regard to the choice of bishops. It may be that the present method of selection generally produces as good results as any other. Personally, I am by no means convinced that

it is not the best method practically available ; and at any rate, I am certain that it compares favourably with the method used in any part of Europe at the present day. But we have to bear in mind, and to insist upon it, that the bishops are our fathers in God first, and lords of parliament afterwards ; and if it should happen, (which God avert) that a man should be chosen who was utterly unfit, it would be the duty of the Church, our bounden duty, to refuse such a man, and let the power which had proposed him do its worst. (c) And the same thing applies to the clergy. Whatever may be the best system of patronage—and that system has much to say for itself which lays the obligation upon the conscience of a single qualified individual—at least we have a right to insist upon it that an incumbent is a parish priest first, and a beneficiary afterwards. And if it should appear that improper persons have sometimes been chosen, surely our duty of rendering to God the things that are God's ought to teach us to claim a fuller power of rejecting such men. (d) And again, as regards marriage. There have recently been very many scandals in our midst in this matter ; and the English Marriage Service has been said over those whose partners in wedlock were yet living. And we are told on all hands in the public press, when such things happen, that the Church ought to render to Cæsar the things that are God's, and to accept the marriage laws of the State. This we cannot, we dare not, we will not do. We will not act as though the words of our Saviour were of

none effect and the Christian law a sham, as if the kingdom of Christ were to be conformed to the kingdoms of this world. It is not, indeed, our business to deny that such unions are in some sense marriages, or to speak of them as incestuous or the like. If too there be any who think (judging from Christian principles, not from mere expediency) that such marriages are not contrary to the law of Christ, they may be mistaken, but at least they are not unfaithful to that law so far as they know it. But, whatever unions may be permitted and recognized as civil marriages in this or any other country, he is no true Christian who does not insist upon it that the law of Christ is the sole boundary and the safeguard of Christian marriage. Here, as in so many other cases, ignorance of the Prayer-book is one of the most dangerous foes that we have to deal with. It is inconceivable that anybody who is familiar with our Marriage Service can fail to see that its standard is and must be the law of Christ, not the secular law ; just as it is inconceivable that anybody who knew the Ordination Service could think that the low views which are current upon Holy Orders are those of the English Church.

And so the matter stands throughout, with regard to the duty which the Church owes to the secular power. There is no panacea which can be so applied as to put an end, once for all, to every conflict ; but at least, in any such conflict, we are bound to remember that the Christian law, so far as we can discern it, is and must be supreme. So only can the

kingdoms of this world ever become the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ.

It will perhaps be said that those who speak in the name of the Church at any particular time may be mistaken as to what the law of Christ really is. No doubt this is so. Probably they have been mistaken many times over ; for we have been taught from the first that our realization of the mind of Christ is progressive. Even we can see clearly that those who spoke in the name of the Church in former days were frequently standing out for things which subsequent experience has shown not to be vital.

But this is nothing to the point. He is following the law of Christ who stedfastly aims at fulfilling what he believes to be the will of Christ. And to hold out on behalf of what is believed to be vital is better by far than to desert this high ground and so to stumble into what events prove to be the better course. The man who disobeys the law of Christ is the man who settles questions such as these by a principle short of the highest. And to do this is to betray the Lord, even though the thing which is done turns out to be not untoward in the long run. It is only by cleaving steadfastly to what we believe to be true, and living up to what we do know, that we can ever be led into all truth.

Brethren, this lesson of the absolute supremacy of the law of Christ, so far as we yet understand it, is one which we need to learn more. To our shame be it said, the spirit of the world has prevailed terribly over us. We are all too ready to accept

whatever we see around us as the best thing that could be at present, and to conform ourselves to that lower level. But such may not be the case. The Church of Christ leads, and is not led by, the civil society. And it is only by learning better the true harmony and order of the spiritual and the secular that we can ever work towards the perfecting of what St. John saw.

The kingdoms of this world *will* in due time be made the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, in perfect fulness. That will not fail. The vision is for an appointed time. The question is not whether God's purpose will be fulfilled, but whether we will be fellow-workers with Him in the fulfilment of His purpose. The question is not whether the day of the Lord will come, but whether, when it comes, we are to have any part or lot in that day.

CHURCH AND STATE.

BY THE

REV. A. C. HEADLAM, B.D.

“Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s ; and unto God the things that are God’s.”—MATT. xxii. 21.

WHEN our Lord spoke these words, He not only met, and met successfully, an immediate difficulty, but He also laid down a broad principle which was to guide the Christian society in the future. He answered an immediate difficulty. We know how even the most spiritual expectations and hopes of the Jews had found their expressions in the idea of a kingdom. The deliverer and redeemer of Israel was to be a Messiah, an anointed King. And this expectation had been intensified by the spirit of opposition on the part of the people to their Roman conquerors. To deliver his fellow-countrymen from the yoke of such hated rulers was the dream of many a Jewish patriot, and had been the inspiration of many a false Messiah ; and thus the Christian era had been inaugurated by hostile insurrections, which had meant only bloodshed and disaster. But now from Galilee one had come who was said to be different to the

others. The Advent message had been proclaimed : "Repent ye ; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." A new Prophet, who spake with authority and not as other men, had begun to teach. Men talked of His power, of the miracles that He worked. Had He not made His triumphal entry into Jerusalem ? Might He not succeed where others failed ? Would He not drive the hated oppressor out of the land ? Would He not free men from the galling tribute paid to an uncircumcised ruler ? Would He not inaugurate the great universal kingdom of peace and righteousness, when the law should go forth from Jerusalem throughout the whole world ? At any rate, the time had come when He should declare Himself. Some were hoping for a leader ; some were anxious to make Him commit Himself. If He denounced the tribute, His enemies would be able to report Him to the government ; if He did not, He would disappoint the expectations of the people. In no friendly spirit He is asked, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not ?" But the kingdom of Jesus was not of this world, and clearly and decisively the answer came, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's ; and unto God the things that are God's." The answer was conclusive, not because it was, as we should say, "clever"—a clever answer is rarely conclusive—but because it introduced a new and deeper principle, not of temporary issue only, but of permanent meaning. It divided henceforth the two spheres of the temporal and spiritual, of the Church and the State. Like many other things said by our Lord, its full meaning was not realized at the

time—men have still to learn much that it implies—but, like many other sayings of His, it was taken up and applied by St. Paul, who here as elsewhere seems to have had a more intuitive insight into the meaning of the words of the Master whom he had not known in the flesh, than had His immediate followers. The Apostle had to deal with practical objections to the civil power, and he does so by reminding his readers that the civil organization of society, equally with the spiritual message of the gospel, comes from God, that it is beneficent in its purpose, not antagonistic to Christian teaching, acting for the well-being of men. “The powers that be are ordained of God.”

It is, then, inherent in Christianity to distinguish very clearly these two spheres of what we call Church and State, the spiritual and the temporal organizations. They are both alike derived from God, they both act for the well-being of mankind, but they work in very different ways and methods, and they appeal to very different motives. The State deals with what is external. It considers men's conduct and intentions; it has little to do with their motives, except as shown in action. It regulates their wealth, and their property, and their lives in relation to one another; it is concerned with their temporal well-being. But the Church should always deal primarily with what is internal. It looks into men's motives, it appeals to their hearts. It is concerned, not directly with what they do, but with what they wish and think and believe and desire, and with their actions as the result and exhibition of this: “the kingdom of God is within

you." And as the aim of Church and State are different, so are the sanctions to which they appeal different. The State appeals to force and rests on force; the Church appeals to conscience, and its sanctions are purely spiritual. The State appeals to force; within a certain sphere it must compel assent to its commands. It cannot indeed exist or remain strong without the sanction of public opinion; it gains increased power by the hold on our hearts and affections which patriotism creates; it has been built up by the sentiments connected with the name of loyalty; it is both softened and strengthened by the aid of the spiritual power: yet ultimately it must rest on force; if it bears the sword in vain, it will not be able to fulfil its functions, to keep together the bonds of civil society, and to work as it ought for the benefit of mankind. But the Church should never be built up on force. It appeals to men's minds and hearts. It has at its command a strong spiritual power. This power *may be*, and sometimes has been, greater than that of the State, especially when most purely spiritual, for it appeals to that which is beyond life, and the power of the State only extends to this life. It is when it relies on any external force that it becomes weaker. "Put up thy sword into the sheath, for they who take the sword shall perish with the sword." The power of the Church consists in its being the preacher of truth and of righteousness and of judgment, and in the influence which this must give it, if it is true to its mission, over the hearts and wills of mankind.

In idea and thought, then, we can clearly separate the two functions of Church and State, and practically history will show us equally clearly how disastrous has always been the encroachment of either on the functions of the other. The one evil we call Ecclesiasticism, the other Erastianism. Either the State becomes priest-ridden, or the Church becomes secularized. The evils of either when presented in an extreme form are equally clear. However much we may admire the power and the grandeur of the mediæval papacy, however much we may realize the actual benefit that it has done to the world, there can be little doubt that when the popes grasped at temporal power, and clung to temporal privileges, its spiritual life was deadened. The spiritual claims of the papacy in the Middle Ages were perhaps excessive, but the chief factor in its decline was its gradual transformation into a rival of the Italian states and cities by the acquisition and growth of its patrimony. We may think its spiritual demands contrary to history, but it is its claim to temporal power and temporal jurisdiction that alienate the continental states from its religion. Our own history can show us the evils of Erastianism. It is from the suppression of Convocation and the transformation of the bishop into a political adherent, that the decay of spiritual life in our Church dates; and even now, in many ways, the influence of Erastian ideas and rules hampers and checks its spiritual life. When a church is ruled by a king, or a king by a church, both suffer.

But side by side with the evil that arises from the encroachment of the Church on the State, or the State on the Church, there is another of similar character which may be equally great. That is the banishment of either clergy or laity from their proper position in the Church. A church which is entirely ruled by the clergy, whether they be those who claim the title "priests" or those "new presbyters" who are but "old priests writ large," will be gradually drawn away from the realities of life; a church in which the laity encroach on the prerogatives of the clergy will be one which forgets the realities of God. The Church is the whole body of Christian people, but each class and section has its own functions, and it is not the function of the laity any more than of the State to regulate the creeds of Christendom, and it is not the function of the clergy to control and regulate their own stipends or to manage the church property. The clergy should not have the privilege, as they had in the mediæval Church, of taxing themselves, or the duty of attending to all the varied secular cares which must accumulate round any society, even with spiritual aims, which occupies a considerable position in the world and has very varied duties to fulfil. The clergy should not "leave the word of God to serve tables."

Our purpose so far has been to make clear the fundamental principles which should regulate the relation of the spiritual and the secular. These are two. One, the distinction in character and work and structure of the Church and State, and the

other the distinction within the Church of the clergy and laity. The State has one mode of work and one sphere of duties, the Church has different duties and different methods. The clergy have their spiritual duties as stewards of the mysteries of God in the Church, the laity have equally their place in the management of the Church's affairs and property.

But how are we to apply these principles? A thoughtful person will probably at once ask, What are we to say about the Establishment? Is not our Established Church inconsistent with our argument? Ought not the Church to be quite free from the control of the State? The real answer to this is that under certain conditions Establishment is inevitable. If the Christian Church represents a small minority of the people, if it is divided into a number of conflicting and to a certain extent antagonistic sects, then it is easy for them all alike to occupy a subordinate and unofficial position. Yet even then, so far as any one of these societies is the owner of property, it will be liable to some of the control implied in Establishment. But once you have a Christian Church embracing the great part of the people, once you have the Church (in whatever form) as a united body face to face with the State, then some form of definite relationship—you may call it concordat, you may call it establishment, you may call it what you will—must exist between the Church and State.

Establishment in some form is inevitable for a Church which implies the nation organized for the

purposes of religion. The State will not allow such a force to exist uncontrolled and unregulated by itself. But there may be an establishment in which the Church hampers and interferes with the sovereign rights of the State, as, for example, in the mediæval Church, when the clergy had the right of taxing themselves and of being tried for criminal offences before their own body; or there may be one in which the power of self-government is taken away from the Church, and it is left simply as a department of the State; or there may be an establishment which means that Church and State alike have their rights guaranteed, and the limits of their duty and prerogatives laid down. Self-government in Church matters is quite compatible with establishment, as the example of the Church of Scotland shows. Establishment may be, as it is there, a guarantee of freedom, for the Established Church can regulate its affairs as it will, but the Free Church by attempting a delusive appearance of freedom from State control, has made it impossible for itself to escape from the burden of the regulations which its founders imposed upon it.

I am to put before you to-night the need of some reform of our Church and its constitution, and to suggest to you the lines on which that reform should take place. I may at once be asked by some of you, What is the need? Cannot we go on very well as we are doing at present? I will only ask you to look at one or two very simple facts. Supposing that the Church as a body wishes the most simple and moderate reform to be made in its constitution, one

simply dealing with its efficiency as a Church, it is necessary to have an Act of Parliament. You want to create a new bishopric, you must get an Act of Parliament, and that Act will compel you to provide, first of all, a stipend of £3000 a year. You demand a very moderate and simple reform—namely, that a bishop should have the right to refuse to institute a man of notoriously immoral character, or that a parish should not be compelled to submit to any one whom a patron may impose on it, it is necessary again to get an Act of Parliament; and it is utterly impossible, in the present state of Parliament, to get any Bill passed which is not taken up by the Government. Or again, you may require changes in the Prayer-book. No form of prayers, however excellent, can be stereotyped for all time. These changes may be of a definite religious character, yet they would have to be discussed by a body which consists of Roman Catholics, of Jews, of every type of Nonconformist, of Parsees, of avowed secularists—a body which for the purpose of governing the nation is admirably representative, but is singularly unsuitable for regulating the affairs of the Church. We are in fact in this position, that all changes, however necessary in the government of the Church, require to be made by a body which has not the time, and is singularly unsuited in its methods and constitution, to accomplish it.

Or take another side of the question. Which of you, dutiful laymen, whom I am addressing has any real voice or control in the government of the Church

to which he belongs? It is clearly the business of the clergy to teach and to preach, and within certain limits to regulate the services of the Church, but there are many questions in which the laity have an equal and just voice, and in which they may reasonably be heard. You have practically no normal, constitutional, regular method of showing your interest or expressing your opinions. You can agitate, you can create a disturbance, you can do little more. Or again, what opportunity have many of you of relieving your clergy from the secular duties imposed upon them? Now these evils are, one may admit at once, not as great as they might be if we were not for the most part a sensible people. If we cannot change or reform our laws we amend them in practice. There has been a very large amount of practical reform done apart from law, but yet every one will know cases in which we are hampered by a cumbersome system. So again, in most places where the clergy and laity are sensible, the laity can practically make their views heard; but yet there is no doubt that the present system throws too much power and responsibility into the hands of the clergy, and makes the laity uninterested because they are freed from duties.

The two reforms, then, that are clearly necessary are that the Church should have the right of self-government in some form and to some extent, and that the laity should have the right of being represented in the government of the Church. But it is said, "The former, at any rate, is impossible. Parliament will never delegate or give up its rights." I

must own that I do not feel that this is so. The right of self-government is possessed, in greater degree than we should demand, by the Church of Scotland. That Church has almost complete freedom of legislation and of trying before its own courts all the cases that concern itself. Parliament is quite conscious of the congested state of its own conditions ; and within certain limits, and with conditions similar to those in the case of bodies like the Universities' Commission, to confer legislative authority on a Convocation, reformed so as to be representative, would be quite in accordance with precedent. It is not my duty to-night to work these proposals out in detail or to propose to you a scheme for conferring self-government on the Church or for creating church councils in parishes. I shall have done enough if I show you that behind any such demand there are certain clear and definite principles which vitally concern the well-being of the Church, that the demand is a reasonable one, and capable, under certain conditions, of being granted.

I am now going to turn to another side of the question, and discuss certain points in which an adjustment of the relations between Church and State will be difficult, and friction between the two is likely to arise. In all questions of property and particularly those which affect the property of individuals, the State will remain supreme. It is essentially on questions of property that the State and the Church will first come into contact. Historically, the first step towards "establishment" was made when Aurelian had to adjudicate

on the question who had the right to the churches in the territory of the recently acquired Palmyra. Whatever right of control over corporate property the Church may acquire, and it is just that it should have very definite rights; whatever judicial independence it may acquire in matters of church law and discipline, and this again is right—the secular court, in any case where the property of an individual is concerned, will always maintain that it may revise the judgment of an ecclesiastical court. This will be exactly the same whether the Church is established or disestablished. Whether its courts have the authority of the State, or are purely private courts, in no case would the right be given up. There is another application of this rule. In some way or other the right of presentation to a benefice has become looked upon as a “property,” the State has sanctioned dealings in such rights as “property,” and has therefore guaranteed to a certain extent the value of the money spent in acquiring them. We may deplore the system that has grown up, we may do all that we can to mitigate the evils that it causes, but we must recognize that the State will not allow anything which savours of confiscation. It will be perfectly willing to prevent the exercise of a private right to the public injury, but it will not take away that right without compensation. The growth and change of public opinion may depreciate the value of livings as a saleable article; but the property exists, and simple confiscation will not be allowed. However ardent you may be, however much you may indulge in rhetorical

language about the evils of the system, you will be simply running your heads against a brick wall, unless in your schemes of reform you recognize existing individual rights. You will only strengthen the position of those whom you attack just as the ardent temperance reformers have hindered rational temperance legislation. The State will be perfectly willing to control and modify individual rights of property when detrimental to the public good. It will interfere, but it will not confiscate. And remember that the Church is not the institution which benefits least from the sacredness with which the law of this country regards the rights of property. England is one of the few countries in Europe in which the Church still enjoys any part of its mediæval property.

A second direction in which Church and State will have a tendency to conflict is in relation to the marriage laws. Here the conflict is natural, for it is the duty of the Church to lead public opinion in all such matters where morality is concerned. The Church must be ahead of public opinion, but the State should lag behind. In many countries it is possible for the two to work together—that will be the case when the religious condition of the people is homogeneous—yet even in such countries the identity of action is often brought about by the Church being unfaithful to its trust. But in this country at the present time, identity of action can only be obtained by the State imposing on a large number of persons a higher ideal of marriage than they are disposed to accept. It is rarely a good thing—certainly

it is not a good thing under present conditions—to impose moral principles by Act of Parliament ; it almost invariably defeats its own ends. On the other hand, it is a gross tyranny, an interference with the rights of the Church, to compel the clergy to marry or to give up their church for marriages which are contrary to church law, and to prevent the Church from exercising a wholesome discipline on its own members. The State has one purpose in regulating marriage ; the Church has another. There is need of adjustment. It is not a case for either to compel the other to conform to its own rules ; it is not wise in the cause of morality to irritate people by regulations above their moral standards ; it is not wise in the State to irritate the clergy of the Church.

And lastly, there is education. There are, I think, one or two broad principles that experience has taught. One is that a purely clerical education and a purely secular education are equally bad. Again, the absolute control of teaching by the State, and a uniform system imposed by it, is as harmful to mental liberty as an ecclesiastical tyranny. In the middle ages there was a triple organization. Side by side with *imperium* and *sacerdotium* with Empire and Church, was *studium*, a third mysterious influence organized as an independent, self-governing body, obtaining privileges from one or other, fighting with one or other, but in the midst of all the turbulence keeping alive the spirit of mental freedom better in many ways than has been the case since, better in

many ways than is possible in many countries which describe themselves as being particularly free.

We demand, and demand justly, that children should be brought up with a religious education. We demand that the religious education which they receive should not be arranged by the State. And again, our demand is just. But then, look at the subject from another point of view. A statesman will demand that as far as possible there should be a national system of education ; that as far as possible education should be the means of bringing together and uniting all the different elements which constitute our nation. We do not wish, if it can be avoided, that there should be two Universities, one for one creed, one for another creed. We should wish all to be united by a common University education. We do not wish in an ordinary country village that there should be two bad schools instead of one good one, and yet we wish that dissenters there as elsewhere should have their children educated as they wish, and that end will not be gained by inventing a compromise of the nature of Undenominationalism. Our duty then is, as elsewhere, to help the State to build up a national system of education in which we can claim our rightful place in educating our own children, and can concede an equal right and place to others.

Another country will give us an illustration. We have all followed with more or less interest the Manitoba school question. We have probably recognized the right of the Roman Catholics to have their children brought up in their own religion. So

far we sympathize with their demands. But we ought to sympathize, I think, equally with the national ideal of uniting different sections of the population as far as possible. We sympathize, then, with the willingness of the more liberal-minded members of both sections to arrange a compromise, and we do not sympathize with the demands of the Roman Church which, not content with this, seeks to control the education of its people, both religious and secular, absolutely.

I have not attempted to go into detail ; I have attempted as far as I could to illustrate principles. The Church and the State have each their sphere, and a healthy condition is produced by each being confined to that sphere. The Church to do its duty efficiently should be a strong, vigorous, self-governing community, in which each class has its proper place and its proper voice. It should be freed from State control, but it should be vigorously prevented from going beyond the limits of its proper functions. The Church of England exists among us as an institution, bound up with our national life, inherited from our forefathers. For centuries it has played its part, sometimes more, sometimes less efficiently in building up the people. In each generation circumstances change, and it requires a certain measure of readjustment. Some readjustment is necessary now, some unwise legislation of the past has to be modified. Its relation towards new conditions of national life has to be modified. This is the duty of the present

generation of churchmen, of the generation which is now growing up. We have received from our forefathers our Church as one of the most beneficent institutions of the country ; let us pass it on to others after us, not worse, but better—strengthened, invigorated, and reformed.

FREEDOM AND ESTABLISHMENT.

BY THE

REV. V. H. STANTON, D.D.

“I will also make thy officers peace, and thine exactors righteousness.”—ISA. lx. 17.

IN a previous sermon of this course, the truth was, as I understand, insisted upon that there is on this earth a vast society, the Church of Christ, which is, on the one hand, unlike civil states and many voluntary associations of men, because it exists ostensibly for spiritual purposes, appeals to spiritual sanctions, and is the organ of spiritual forces, whereas their immediate and manifest ends are of a material and secular kind, and they rest on physical force or mutual agreement. On the other hand, it is like them in that it has an outward form. It is a kingdom which, though “not of this world” is “in the world,” and cannot, therefore, help being subject in a measure to the laws of this present order. Its members associate with one another, they are seen and known, and are meant to be so. They cannot dispense with the use of material means. And the methods which they follow in acting together are necessarily in

many respects similar to those which men employ in other cases when they unite for common objects.

Into this society, at once spiritual and visible, you were admitted when you were baptized into the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

I am to speak to you to-day of the government of the society. It would be impossible for me, in the short space of time during which I can ask for your attention, to treat satisfactorily of this great subject as a whole, or even it may be of a single one of its great aspects, historical, theological, and practical. These, moreover, are so connected with one another, that there is some danger in separating them. Accordingly I shall seek rather to arouse interest, to provoke and to guide inquiry, by suggesting some considerations which should serve to impress us with the importance of the subject, and should influence our minds in the study of it.

I. First, I would have you reflect that it is by virtue of possessing a government that a society is something more than a mere conglomeration of atoms; thereby it is an order instead of a chaos. Hence it is in its government that a society most fully realizes, as it were, its own existence. Through its government it is able to perform corporate acts. And on the nature and the efficiency of its government the character and the vigour of its common life to no small extent depend. Hence it would be well that the members of the Church should concern themselves with the question of its government, should have some real knowledge of its constitution, and at

all times follow the working thereof with attention and interest, if it were only for the sake of quickening in their minds the consciousness that the Church *is* a true society, and of becoming more deeply influenced by the inspiring motives which that thought supplies.

This would be true, even if the Church and its government were merely of human institution ; and it does not cease to be so when we recognize that they have a divine origin. Bonds by which we are united do not become less close and strong for being divinely given, instead of chosen by ourselves. Further, when we recognize that the Church has a divine origin, we see that the question of its government is significant not only with reference to the means whereby we are formed into one body now, but also in regard to the links whereby we are united to Christ Himself and to His Apostles, to whom He committed the charge of founding His Church. By the close of the apostolic age, the main outlines of the building had been marked out, and in the fabric which has been actually reared and which is in our midst at this day, we may—in spite of all the additions that have been made, and errors that have been committed in the long lapse of time—trace still the design of the great master-builders.

There has been, moreover, throughout the ages a regular transmission of authority. Hence we are permitted to feel that even the external order of the spiritual kingdom is a means in and through which we may have fellowship with the Apostles, nay, with

the Lord Himself. We are entitled to regard whatsoever is rightly done in the Church as done in accordance with His will, and, as it were, at His command, and as a carrying out of the very work which He began.

There are Christians who look upon the Church's constitution and government as non-essential in all respects, because these things are external. All forms, they think, viewed in relation to spiritual religion must be purely accidental. They would maintain, for example, that episcopacy, if it is to be justified at all, must be justified simply as a matter of present expediency. The idea that Apostolical succession can be necessary to a valid ministry seems to them to savour of superstition and of a belief in magic. But it will be evident from what has been said already that if this doctrine is to be fairly judged, it must be viewed in connection with the larger and more fundamental question whether our Lord did, or did not, found a visible society, which should last through the succeeding generations of mankind. If He did, then there is nothing strange or unreasonable in the thought that the officers of this society should be required to derive their commission lineally from Him, and that He should endue the ministerial acts of those who are thus duly set apart with special power and grace. For this is manifestly an effective instrument for preserving through the ages the identity of the society and of compacting it together.

Again, when we endeavour to make improvements in the organization of the Church, we must ever

remember that we are dealing with an institution which includes features that are of divine appointment, and we must beware of rashly tampering with them. The Church retains, indeed, the right of adapting herself to new circumstances and needs. The very manner in which she came into being, and in which her framework was formed, affords a ground for believing this. Christ trained the minds and characters of His Apostles. Then He left them to act in the power of the Divine Spirit whom He sent to them after His own ascension into heaven. And thus, under the guidance always of that illumination, they took each step which circumstances dictated, and in doing so both applied the great truths which Christ had imparted, and also used their ordinary experience as men and their knowledge of the forms of the Jewish synagogue and even of Gentile associations. Thus we may truly say that the *power of adaptation* has been sanctioned from the first as a principle of church-life. It is indeed a characteristic in some measure of all living organisms; such the Church would not be, if she had it not. But so also is the *principle of continuity*; and right must be done to both these.

The primary reason, then, why the Church requires an adequate measure of self-government is that she may be herself. She has constitutional principles of her own which have to be maintained; she has a corporate existence, of which her members must be made duly conscious.

2. But the Church also needs her own government,

her own synods and officers, in order that she may properly fulfil her mission. Measures have to be adopted or should be adopted for promoting her practical efficiency, changes to be made in antiquated methods, scandals to be removed, new plans to be devised and put in practice. All this is of great importance ; but a deeper view may be taken even of this aspect of the question. The great work appointed for the Church is that she should be a witness to the truth of God, and reflect the mind of Christ before the world. To this all her individual members are called. But that the function may be fully discharged, that the testimony may be delivered with due impressiveness, the Church must do it in corporate acts. And for this she needs above all to be filled with the Divine Spirit, and to keep her high calling ever before her eyes ; but, besides this, she must have organs through which she may give utterance to her faith and her law.

3. Now when we turn from such thoughts as these to the actual condition of the Church of England, we find much that is inconsistent with the true idea of the Church, and that urgently demands reformation. And the task of effecting many of the improvements that are needed is undoubtedly rendered far more complex and difficult through the existing connection with the State. We believe the Church of England to be founded upon Apostolical order, to have inherited her life from the Divine author of the Church's being, to be a portion of the Church Catholic ; but she is bound by not a few fetters. The answer will come

then from one quarter at least: "Consent to be free, and you may speedily be released from your bonds. Join with us in pressing for the dissolution of the union of Church and State; and as soon as this has come to pass, it will be possible for the true idea of the Church's system, as you conceive it, to be worked out. Renounce the privileged position and the wealth which are grave hindrances in the way of the recovery of primitive purity." If we, who feel deeply the need of Church Reform, cannot respond to this invitation, it is not that we have any doubt about the sacredness of those principles of which I have spoken, nor (I believe) that we are held back by any attachment to merely material advantages for ourselves, or even for the Church. And we readily admit that the conduct of the State to the Church might assume a character which would render it imperatively necessary to agitate for separation. But we are convinced that the result to the life of the nation of the separation of Church and State, and so of emphasizing still further the distinction between the secular and the religious spheres, would be a far poorer thing than that of their union, even as it now is, and still more as it might well become.

Therefore we think that great patience is needed in dealing with the problem of their relations, and that it is worth while to endure for a considerable time what is amiss, and to submit to many disappointments in our efforts to rectify it, rather than to destroy the good with the bad.

And in point of fact it would seem that the

restoration of some rights of the Church which have with time been insensibly impaired, and some new adjustments, such as would not in any way interfere with the duty of the State to see that the Church employs her property in legitimate ways and to safeguard the rights of individuals in regard to material things, which is analogous to her duty in regard to all trust-property, would go far towards giving the Church the opportunity and power which she requires in order to be able fully to put forth her energies in the sphere proper to herself.

4. How then shall we act with the view to the attainment of such an end? First, I would say, let us reflect how many ways there are in which the common life of the Church might be more fully developed in the parish, the diocese, and the Church of England as a whole, without any intervention of Parliament, or change in the relations of Church and State, and let us make the most of these. Let us seek to become more closely united by the bonds of Christian sympathy. Let us acquire the habit of co-operating. Let us, through conferring together, form a sound and strong Church opinion on great spiritual and moral questions. It may well be that God is waiting to give more opportunities and powers to this English Church of ours, which many of us love as our own souls, when we shall have learned to make fuller use of those which are already at our command, than we have done yet, in spite of all the progress which has been made in recent years. It is His own law :—"to him that hath shall be given, and from

him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath." And certainly this would be the way to prepare ourselves for turning to good account any extension of the legal facilities for corporate action which we may succeed in obtaining. We have scope and need now for cultivating among ourselves those qualities without which bodies of men prove unequal to the task of self-government, a spirit of moderation to save us from being led by illusions and to enable us to see things as they truly are, an instinct for choosing wise and worthy leaders, and that readiness to suppress self-will and to refrain from self-assertion which even men whose aims are professedly the same need if they are to be saved from acting at cross-purposes.

Again, let churchmen and churchwomen, so far as they may severally find it possible, inform themselves more fully about the history of the Church and the principles of church order, so that they may be qualified to take their part in the Church's common action, and that the general voice of the Church may be the expression of genuine knowledge and wisdom.

Qualities such as these will, moreover, be required in no small measure in pursuing particular reforms, and along with them also high resolution and courage. The difficulties are likely to prove great ; but we have no right to be deterred by difficulties. We must, as we love the Church, strive to remove evils that we see in its condition, and to obtain for it the good of which it is capable. There is one law for institutions and for individuals, that if they are not endeavouring

to march forward on the road of progress they will fall back and become enfeebled. Even as we must individually press towards the mark of our high calling in Christ Jesus, so must we as members of the Church seek that it may become what He would have it, and will at length make it—"free from spot or wrinkle or any such thing, holy and without blemish."

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

BY THE

RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD.

“Tell it unto the Church.”—ST. MATT. xviii. 17.

“My kingdom is not of this world.”—ST. JOHN xviii. 36.

CHRIST teaches us to pray daily that God's kingdom may come. Christ also tells us that the kingdom of God is in the midst of us. St. Paul defines the kingdom of God to be “righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.”

We believe that by the development of this kingdom within and around us, we shall be doing our part, as fellow-workers with God, in bringing the kingdoms of this world under the rule of Christ, and setting up His everlasting kingdom. We believe that the Christ-ordained instrument for this purpose in the world is the visible Church which He founded, the Church Militant here on earth—militant against every form of evil which is antagonistic to the righteous rule of God. My task this morning is to vindicate the right of this visible Church to govern herself.

Briefly to state the grounds on which self-government

is claimed for the Church, the conditions which limit it, and the lines which it should follow, is all that I can attempt to do. Even so, I fear I must trench somewhat on the province of others who are to address you.

That there is a growing feeling among churchmen that they have lost a part of their legitimate inheritance will not be denied. Churchman and citizen are no longer convertible terms, and churchmen are sore because those who repudiate church order, or church doctrine, have power to obstruct reforms, and to take indirectly a share in the government of the Church of which they do not profess to be members. So churchmen ask how they are to vindicate their exclusive rights?

Before answering that question I will ask you to give your attention to one or two thoughts on our present position.

1. As churchmen we must not forget that our difficulty is mainly caused because the Church has lost her ancient hold on the Nation. Of the people generally not a few decline to accept her teaching; a great multitude hold aloof in an attitude of indifference. Consequently the House of Parliament which represents the Nation, no longer represents the laity of the Church. That this is so is a reproach to the Church. Her bishops and her priests (*i.e.* those of her members to whom authority to teach in the Church is committed) have failed so to present the everlasting gospel to the people of this country as to retain them within her borders, or so to lift up

the Christ amongst them as that He should draw all men unto Him. There are sins of omission on the part of the Church which are sufficient to make the strongest terms of penitence which we apply to ourselves in the Litany, or in the Confession in the Communion Service, none too strong for the best of us. We clamour for freedom from the State because of the errors in religion with which the State is honeycombed ; we ought to humble ourselves in the dust because we have given place for so much error by our failures in doctrine and in practice.

2. In adapting church government to existing conditions we must give due consideration to the State, *i.e.* to the secular government. Its province differs from that of the Church, but it is ordained of God, and claims our loyal obedience in its own sphere. Its aim is to secure the temporal welfare of every citizen, and this is no mean aim, it is a work for God. "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" (Mark xii. 17). "The powers that be are ordained of God, . . . they are the ministers of God, . . . wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for *conscience* sake" (Rom. xiii. 1-5). The State is bound to refuse to allow any coercive powers to the Church which may appear to it to be prejudicial to the common weal. The Church deals with sin, the State with crime ; the Church with conscience, the State with conduct. Temporal punishments are for the State, spiritual discipline is for the Church. Coercive jurisdiction is for the State, the Church must draw by the

cords of love. It follows that the sphere of the self-government of the Church is limited to spiritual things. The Church as a corporation can possess property, and the Church can exercise coercive jurisdiction, but only with the sanction of the State, and so far as the law of the land permits. "My kingdom," says Christ, "is not of this world." The liberty which the Church may claim to govern herself is in relation to questions of church order and to discipline. There can be no question of fresh definitions of doctrine, or of fresh developments of things to be believed beyond "the faith once delivered to the saints." The Bible, the three Creeds, the Canons of the first four General Councils, settle for our Church her faith. But from the beginning the Church has decided questions of order for herself, and has exercised discipline on her members. "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies and [with the limitation which follows] authority in controversies of faith" (Article xx.).

Of whom then is the Church, which claims to govern herself, composed? The answer to this question is to be found in the Church Catechism. The Church consists of the whole number of the baptized. These received their Christian name in their Baptism, and were made members of Christ, the children of God, and *inheritors of the kingdom of heaven*. And such they remain, unless they have been severed from the body and cast out of their inheritance by a formal act of the Church; or have deliberately repudiated the faith; or have formally joined some other body

which denies the faith as expressed in the baptismal formula, and interpreted in the Creeds of our Baptism and of our Communion.

The self-government of the Church, then, postulates that the whole body takes its proper share in the management of its affairs, including, as I believe, the settlement of questions of order and the exercise of discipline.¹

Now, it is evident that in these days both the legislative and the executive functions can only be exercised by representation. But the representative bodies of the Church—the councils which are to decide questions of order and to exercise discipline—must not consist of bishops and priests alone, they must include representatives of the laity. The form of procedure at meetings of the council, or synod, is one which, no doubt, needs careful consideration, but with which I am not at this moment concerned. It is sufficient for me that I am satisfied

¹ "I have urged," says Dr. Moberly, in the preface to his Bampton Lectures, 1868, on *The Administration of the Holy Ghost* (and all who wish to study the question should read these lectures), "that the full co-operation of the laity of the Church, not as a matter of benevolence or bounty, but as a matter of debt and duty, is not more absolutely necessary in practice than it is indispensable in theory to the full power and efficacy of the Church." And again, "I will venture to say, looking to the theory as well as to the earliest practice of the Church of Christ, that while the office of teaching belongs specially to the ordained clergy, giving them the 'prerogative' voice in matters of faith, the authority, even in those great things, belongs in such sort to the universal body, as that the lay people too, in their place and degree, have the right and duty of sanctioning (and therefore, of course, of refusing to sanction) the determinations of the ordained clergy; while in other subjects, more or less secular, their influence and counsel is of the greatest importance and necessity."

that it would be in accordance with the principles and practice of the Apostolic Church, that no decree, no disciplinary decision, should be complete without the assent of the laity. That the representatives of the laity should be communicants of the Church all will agree ; but that all the baptized (not under the disqualifications which I have mentioned) should, when of full age, and having received the gift of the Holy Ghost in confirmation, vote for these representatives, I am fully convinced ; and I am of the opinion of those who assert that to withhold from them the franchise would be to inflict a grievous spiritual loss on the Church. The claim of the whole body rests on the revelation of God the Holy Ghost. "There is one body, and one Spirit." Into the name of that Spirit every member of the body has been baptized ; all the members are partakers of that one Spirit. For the full utterance of the Spirit there must be the concurrence of the whole body. It may be the proper function of bishops alone, or of bishops and presbyters, to initiate and to formulate, but the body of the laity must confirm. We fall back, we cannot help it, on the old illustration of the body and its members. Christ the Head, governing the body by His will : the Holy Ghost the animating Spirit of the body, the Giver of active life to the members : the several organs with their respective functions, the hands that minister the Sacraments, the mouth that speaks the Word, ministers of Christ to the body, and ministers of the body, speaking and acting for the body in the presence of Christ. But

the body is that for which these organs exist ; they are powerless without the body, they are useless without the body.¹

Archbishop Benson, commenting on the Councils of Carthage which dealt with the difficult subject of the rebaptizing of heretics, points out that, in his opinion, the erroneous decision to which these councils came was due to Cyprian's departure from the principle on which he had based his action at the beginning of his episcopate—the principle of taking no step without consulting the laity, and securing their co-operation ; and, further, how it was the silent but irresistible force of the opinion of the laity which reversed that decision as time went on. The ministering organs must serve the body according to its own needs ; they must administer food which the body can receive and assimilate : that which the body rejects cannot be wholesome. They must deal tenderly and judiciously with every part, specially with those that are weaker.

¹ "The individuals only derive their life from the life of the body."

"It is not the life that is in the hand, the life that is in the eye, the life that is in the ear, which, together with the life of all the other members, make up the life which is in the body. On the contrary, it is the life which is in the body which is the principle of the life that is in each and all of them."—Moberly, pp. 51, 52.

"The great life itself, the great deposit of the spiritual life, remains in the body at large. There is the true inheritor of Christ, the real agent which, instinct with the Holy Ghost, mighty in numbers, mighty in diverse gifts, mighty in faith, mighty in holiness, irresistible and all-powerful if it were as perfect as it might be in holiness, still more irresistible and all-powerful if it were at full and entire unity in itself—unity of doctrine, unity of love, and unity of action—contains in itself the real principle of absolute conquest and mastery over the whole world."—*Ibid.*, p. 57.

The members must all be duly exercised. You want to restore, not to cut off, the limb that has been partially paralyzed by inaction. It must be stimulated into fresh life and activity, that strength may be added to the body. We cannot complain of the indifference of the laity, so long as they are excluded from their proper share in the administration of church affairs.¹

Still, as things are with us, any action on our part must for the present be purely voluntary, and voluntary action is seldom generally adopted. But there is no reason why councils should not be voluntarily formed in parishes, in dioceses, in provinces,—(not mere committees for carrying on good works, or promoting special organizations, but) councils whose direct spiritual character should be recognized ; with whom would rest the power of preventing arbitrary alteration of lawful customs in ritual, and of settling questions of church order not affecting the ministry of the Word and Sacraments ; to whom also should

¹ To quote Bishop Moberly once more, “I cannot but think that the causes which have operated to exclude the lay people from the direct participation which, in their degree, they might seem to have the right of claiming in the consultations of the Church, have operated also in a most baneful way to diminish their sense of responsibility in respect of Church truth and of Church work in these later ages, and of their own position in regard to both. While they have been ineffectual in excluding them from indirect power—a power working with great and often very injurious effect even in the most sacred things—they have put them into a position which is at once more or less antagonistic to the clergy, and which has seemed to set them free from the responsibility which is really and inalienably theirs” (Moberly, p. 125). It is nearly thirty years since these words were written, but they might have been written even more emphatically to-day.

be referred individual cases before any disciplinary action be taken, in accordance with the teaching of the gospel and the course adopted by St. Cyprian in the case of the lapsed. "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. . . . If he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, *tell it unto the Church*; but if he neglect to hear the *Church*, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican" (Matt. xviii. 15-17). Churchmen and churchwomen equally would vote for such councillors; and thus the whole body would be voiced. The council itself would speak and act with a spiritual authority which would be recognized and accepted by all.

And if any move in this direction can to-day be only voluntary, yet the recollection of our present weakness, of our foolish and injurious controversies, of scandals arising from the conflict between the marriage law of the Church and that of the State, of difficulties in the interpretation of rubrics giving rise to a variety of use which distracts the quiet minds of simple folk, of our lost hold on the people, should stimulate us to vigorous effort to press our claim for the recognition by the State of a legitimate freedom of government for the Church in matters of order and internal discipline, and to regain her lost spiritual power by restoring to the whole body the rights which belong to every member by virtue of the indwelling Spirit of God. It is thus, and thus only,

that we can hope to see her regain her strength, cease from internal strife and soul-deadening controversy, commend herself to the conscience of the nation, and once more win her way to the hearts of the people.

As we think of these things there rises up before us the vision of a Church in which every citizen shall feel that there is a place for him to occupy, and a work for him to do ; a Church which shall attract within her borders all that is morally and intellectually best and noblest in the nation ; a Church that witnesses to men of an ever-present God, King of kings, Maker and Governor of the universe. Her members will be strong in the strength of freedom and of loyalty ; the freedom of sons whose position is recognized in the house of their Father ; the loyalty of soldiers who advance with confidence, according to their ranks, under the banner of their King. Members they will be of a living, healthy, active body, knit together in the unity of the Spirit, pressing forward eagerly and persistently, unsatisfied until God's ways are made known unto men, His saving health unto all nations. Then the prayer of Christendom will be answered ; a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, will take the place of the old, and the Kingdom of God will come.

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

BY THE

REV. H. S. HOLLAND, M.A.

“As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free: and have all been made to drink into one Spirit. . . . Now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body. . . . And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.”—
I COR. xii. 12, 13, 18-20, 26, 27.

THE thrill with which we declaim this exultant passage of St. Paul, feels itself suddenly smitten by the wrath of a terrible sentence: “O thou wicked and slothful servant!” For do we not stand convicted of having hid the Lord’s treasure in a napkin? of having buried it underground?

Here is the secret of man’s being, by which a thousand perplexities which have riven states and shattered churches could have been solved. St. Paul has given it its perfect and its final utterance. And, nevertheless, we have let it slumber in our ears,

until it has had to be laboriously, slowly, painfully rediscovered by those who, too often, had been thrown wholly outside our gospel—students in biology, reformers in social economics, scientific evolutionists—whom we left to battle for a truth that was already lying, unused, in our possession; whose efforts to assert it we probably conspired to denounce.

And, now, when they have, in spite of our fierce opposition, proved their case, how are we going to persuade them, in their flush of victory over us, that it was our own message, our secret, after all, which they were delivering?

What is this secret? It is the secret, verified in human society, confirmed and crowned in the divine society of God, that man's innermost individuality can only be interpreted, liberated, perfected, through the body, the society of which it is a member.

"Ye are the Body of Christ." That is the premiss of all our spiritual existence, of all our activities, of all our development. Without starting from this basal verity, we should be absolutely meaningless, unintelligible to ourselves and to others. Nor meaningless only, but also powerless. The force that is in us to act has its primal spring, not in ourselves, but in the Body. Our prayers are the expression of the whole Body's aspiration. Our will is a verification of the purpose on which the entire Body is set. Our feelings draw their heat out of the central fire of corporate emotion.

"Ye are the Body of Christ." That is the previous fact on which we ground ourselves. It is what we

already are, as soon as we begin to act, to think, to speak for ourselves as Christians. In speaking, thinking, acting, we do but discover what it was that had been presupposed by our very capacity to do anything religious at all. We find ourselves "members." We show, by all we do, that we belong to a larger whole. Any one, watching us, would have to run his eye back to the Body in order to understand our motion, our intention. "Obviously this is a member," he would say, "a limb, which is controlled from beyond itself. It could not so behave if it were complete in itself. To determine the motive and value of its conduct, everything must turn on our knowing what the Body to which it belongs is about, and what force it can place at the disposal of its member."

"Ye are the Body of Christ." We were so created, when we were made anew by water and the Spirit. Before that remaking we were not ourselves. We were not endowed with our present force of individuality. We were not endowed with those distinct capacities which constitute us members, each with a definite function. Our spiritual individuality in Christ flows into us out of our baptismal incorporation. It is fed out of the resources of the common heritage. Our personal identity is not separable from the community, for it is itself the issue of our union with Christ, who is the Head of the whole Body. Our personality, with all its separate gifts, discloses itself in and through our fellowship.

How remote, obscure, mystical it all sounds! So

far away from the practical common-sense of Englishmen! Well, perhaps it is; but then perhaps English common-sense is not the one and only instrument by which spiritual truth can be tested. And if St. Paul carries us far into the mystical heights and depths, it may be well for our English practical faculties to stretch themselves to his measure, and see whether they have not missed what is, after all, according to the Apostle, the heart of the whole matter.

For instance, the words of the Apostle contradict our favourite English superstition, that a man is at his best when he is most independent of others. "Ye are the Body of Christ." In that lies your real strength—to be of the Body. So he says. But the English retort is, "I don't want any Body to help me. I can go my own way. I can make my own living. I can take care of myself." That is his special boast in all secular affairs of this world, and the same ideal of sturdy individualism will surely hold good in spiritual things. He is not going to cease to be an Englishman because he is religious.

No, indeed; but let us look a little closer into this boast of his in secular business. How did he win that sturdy, independent self-reliance which is so characteristically English? Surely out of his stock, his blood, his race; out of the corporate history; out of the national brotherhood. He is English—that is why he is independent, self-reliant, masterful. He draws his courage, his tenacity, not from that which

he has in himself alone, but from that which he shares with others. He did not capture it by his own right hand. It was born into him ; he was made so. That is the real significance of his own appeal to his national character. "I am independent, because I am not merely an individual, but an Englishman." The strength of his personality is itself a witness that he belongs to the Body.

And if so, then he is drawing exactly the wrong moral when he says, "In my sturdy independence, I go my own way ; I can take care of myself." On the contrary, his independence itself forbids him to go his own way. It knits him fast into the great Body of Englishmen. It is the pledge of his fellowship, the signal of his incorporation in the national community. He is, by virtue of it, in debt to them all ; under obligation to share their life ; unable to isolate himself from their fortunes. He holds England's honour in fee ; he is responsible for its exercise. His entire race rises and falls, according to his behaviour. They live in him ; their credit, their name, their hopes, are at stake in all he says or does. He cannot go his own way, without carrying them all along with him. He proclaims himself, wherever he passes, to be theirs, a member of the Body.

For, indeed, they and their forefathers have conspired together to breed in him the independent spirit of which he is so proud. It came to him through the blood of many a hero, who fought and died for English liberty long ago. It came to him

out of the toil, and patience, and skill, and suffering of the thousands whose united labour has gone to fashion our free English life of to-day. It came to him out of the slow and painful growth of our political story, built up out of the unnumbered experiences of all who ever wrote, or spoke, or worked, for English manhood, and English justice, and English truth. Nothing is his own. That which is most his own, is also most theirs. And the point I would press is, that his own individuality is not weakened, but kindled, vitalized, reinforced by his recollection that he owes it, not to himself, but to others. The sense that it is shared, that it is a common heritage, that it is typical, that it is born into him by blood and bone—this fires his eye, this warms his heart, this braces his nerve, this rallies his will. If it were only he who mattered, he would break under a strain; he would yield in some black, critical hour; but he must stand out for old England; she must not come to shame through him. That is the memory that lifts his fainting soul. Like the corporal of the Kentish Buffs sung of in Doyle's famous ballad—

“ He only knows that not through him
Shall England suffer wrong.”

All this is so familiar to us. Yet what does it mean?

It means just what the Apostle declares in my text, *i.e.* that the individual man in us can only grow strong by force of its incorporation in a body. Yet that is what we English are always denying in spiritual things. We cannot believe it when it meets

us in the form of the Catholic Church. How many Englishmen, even for a moment, believe that the Church is in any way a necessity of their spiritual growth, of their full spiritual force? They may belong to it for a hundred different reasons, but never for that. They may like it, prefer it to other organizations, have acquired a habit for it. It is suitable; it has national functions to fulfil; they are glad to make use of the means of grace it offers them. But is it not always regarded as accidental, so far as the spiritual life is concerned? It is nothing more, they say, than an external organization, a framework, a lodging, and nothing external can affect the inner spirit vitally.

They themselves are superior to all forms. They could go their own way well enough without it, in the spiritual independence which is the mark of a sturdy English individuality.

So they say. And if the divine society were merely an external arrangement for clubbing our separate efforts, a mechanism for giving force to our desires, it would be perfectly true.

But what if the Church be not merely an external form, but an internal life? What if the outward organization be but the expression of an inward and real necessity? What if our spiritual union with Christ include, in itself, the elements of an essential brotherhood with our fellows, so that in belonging to Him we belong also to them? What if this fellowship with them be inseparable from our salvation in Him? If so, then our innermost individual

self cannot live, grow, develop towards God without witnessing to this inherent citizenship in a divine Society of the Redeemed. Its very individuality is social, it is rooted in brotherhood. It has the type, the character, of a community, of a nation. It cannot move, act, speak without testifying to a common parentage in the one Father, a common brotherhood in the Redeemer, a common heritage in the one Spirit. Whenever it acts according to its Christian instincts, the life of all must issue through it, even as the typical life of England shows itself through and in the English individuality of character; all who are in Christ would recognize that action as their own, for every act of every true child of God is an energy, in and through him, of the one Christ, who is the one Lord of all life.

This is the secret law of our being which is declared to us in my text: "Ye are the Body of Christ, and members in particular."

To be in Christ, is, of sheer necessity, to be identified, in a corporate whole, with all who are His. We cannot pick and choose. We cannot discuss whether, now that we are saved, we had better unite ourselves with others or no. Nay! We belong to them in being saved. It is done. There is no question about it. We are now of one Body with them—members one of another. This is so by the constitution of things. We can only be strong through recognizing it. And the one question is how to realize it in act; how to embody it in fact.

And, now, the external organization of the

visible Church appears with quite a new authority. It is no outward accident, no temporal expedient, this ecclesiastical fabric. It is the necessary fulfilment of a spiritual principle. It is the embodiment of a life. It is that without which our true nature would be incomplete, unrevealed, unliberated. It is a sacrament, the outward visible sign and pledge of an inward invisible movement. Redemption itself makes us citizens; and this citizenship discovers itself, declares itself, through the Church. Without this outward realization, our redemption, however real in itself, is missing its proper growth, is sterile of its full and natural fruits. Without finding itself encompassed with a visible Church, the soul is in exile, pining for its home. The passion of patriotism, that pricks in the blood, is unsatisfied. It prays and cries for that Holy City, where it should go up in the multitude of the redeemed, with the songs of those that keep holy day.

“Ye are the Body of Christ.” The individualism which makes it so difficult for us to believe in the necessity of a Body, of a Church, haunts us even in our churchmanship. We may be loyal and even devoted churchmen, and yet be still valuing the Church so highly, solely as ministering to our own individual needs. This is the temper that lurks under the phrase “Church Privileges”—the privileges supplied to us by belonging to the Church. We want good spiritual food, and we give thanks that our food is the best that can be had. That is the limit of our thankfulness. We use the resources

and treasures stored in the Church to enrich our own lives, and are glad. Thanks, indeed, be to God for these unspeakable gifts! But, so far, we are individuals still; our religion turns round our Self, our very churchmanship only expresses the wealth on which we can draw for our individual requirements. "We feast on fat things"—Apostolic ministry, Eucharistic sacrifice, Catholic worship.

But, if we stop there, at our own comforts, we have not even begun to understand what St. Paul meant when he cried, "Ye are the Body."

To be of the Body, is to be at the service of the Body. It is the Body that disposes of us, and not we, merely, who draw upon the Body. We do, indeed, draw our life from it, but only that we may become instruments to minister to its uses, organs of its will, expressions of its integrity, of its solidarity, of its central hope. Each one of us is "a member," with an office to discharge on its behalf. We cannot fitly belong to it, and not have a use, a function, a task.

This is the principle, the secret, of the growth, of the strength, which should be ours through belonging to the Body. And it is this Pauline conception that we have so utterly lost through the present ecclesiastical situation in England. The Church sets the main bulk of its laity no task, it makes no demands upon their services. She leaves it to the zeal of the clergyman to get round him the half-dozen laymen, who serve as churchwardens and sidesmen. But even these appear to be kindly volunteers; all the rest she leaves

alone, content to suggest that she exists to baptize them, to confirm them, to marry them, to bury them, never to be the mistress of their energies, the source of their responsibilities, the royal motherhood which demands of every son and daughter that they play their part in sustaining the level, the warmth, the healthiness, the activities, of her corporate life.

How, indeed, is it possible for the laity to be aware of their duties, to be conscious of this call, while the Church itself is so vaguely out-lined, so indefinite, so indiscriminate in its fluctuating mass, with its practical policy so remote in its working, so entirely concealed by legal and technical wrappings, so blocked by impenetrable and mysterious ecclesiastical formula? How is any one able to imagine himself necessary as a member in a Body? This would only be, if the Body could reveal itself clear and compact, in its orderly integrity, with visible outlines, with solid substance, with precise limits, with definite functions, with graduated ministries, with necessary, positive, undeniable needs, which each, in his separate place, is charged to fulfil.

And it is the object of Church Reform to free the Body from all that now hinders this, its compact solidity, from coming into view. This Church Reform League desires to restore to the laity their true and vital membership. Its aim is that every genuine believer should be made aware of his responsibilities, of his functions, of his obligations, for the welfare of the whole Church, and that he should be given free

and authorized room in which to exercise his gifts on her behalf.

Every full member of the Church should feel—"Her business is my business. Her responsibility is mine. I am concerned with all she does. When she fails, I fail. Her problems are mine; I have to bear my part in finding their solution. And this is not according to my free choice whether I choose to take up church work or not, but by legal prerogative, by official right. She herself calls upon me to take my place, to give my vote, to fulfil my ministry. She looks for me to help her to take the right direction, to see that she discharges her task with efficiency."

Every lay member, man or woman, ought to find this public service of the Church a necessity which belongs to their membership.

But this can only be, if two conditions are secured.

(1) The Body must define itself, must govern itself. Hence self-government is our primary object. We ask you to join the League in giving distinctness and reality to the self-government of the Church, by which alone the laity can be given their genuine and orderly functions, according to recognized principles, and in real validity of right. This is the primary, the supreme necessity, if the laity are to have anything to do for the Church. So long as she has no self-direction, no capacity to control, to correct, to reform her own action, the laity must remain practically unused or unneeded.

Here, then, is the first principle of the League.

It is no good to call upon the laity to serve, until there is real work for them to do.

(2) And, then, secondly, if the laity are to be called into action, there must be some clear understanding what you mean by a layman. As the Body must be given substance, precision, stability, if it is to govern itself, so, too, the layman must be something genuine, definite, substantial, if he is to assist in governing. Membership in the Body cannot be a vague, uncertain, unintelligible relationship to the divine society. It must mean a man who has clearly taken up the duties, the privileges, the responsibilities of his citizenship.

"Ye are the Body of Christ, and members in particular." The words, as we now stand, have only a mystical and vague meaning. And that means, to ninety-nine out of every hundred Englishmen, no meaning at all. Our urgent task, in this Church of England, is to get them translated into actual concrete fact. We must find real practical obligations laid upon us, in which we realize what it is to be the member in a Body. So only shall we purge out of our religion the selfishness which is its curse. Not for our own comfort, not for our good, shall we hold by Jesus Christ; but the act by which we hold to Him for our own salvation will itself be the inspiration that sends us out to minister for others, to love the brotherhood, to build up the Body of Christ. It will be impossible to be a churchman and not to be unselfish.

CHURCH WORK.

BY THE

REV. C. F. ROGERS, M.A.

“And without him was not anything made that hath been made.”
—JOHN i. 3.

A FEW words may often contain a statement of immense comprehension. We know how little we can see of the consequences of a single act, and in the same way we seldom realize how much is involved in the single fact of Christ's birth. For Christianity is not a collection of disjointed beliefs, but consists in one central doctrine, the divinity of our Lord, from which all others follow in rational sequence, one belief in the incarnation which harmonizes all the rest of creation.

Christ is the crown of religion. Round Him as a centre all the doctrines of the creed are ranged. If Christ be not risen we have no hope of immortality ; if Christ be not ascended we cannot believe in His kingdom, the Church on earth, or the Church in heaven : without Christ the sacraments are meaningless, apart from Him we cannot know the Father.

Christ not only unifies our faith, He also gathers

in Himself the partial truths of heathen religions. There is much that is good in them, and Christianity claims to take their place, not by declaring them effete superstitions, but by showing a more excellent way; it supersedes them by including all that is true, and focussing the scattered rays into one point of complete revelation.

Christ is the climax of nature, the crown of science. By nature we mean all that wonderful unfolding of life and power by which we are surrounded, from the measured sweep of the seasons and the swaying of the tides, the pushing of life in the blades of grass, the beauty of flowers, the lusciousness of fruits, the powers of limb in the beasts and of song in the birds, to all that rises to perfection in the faculties of man, his reason, memory, passions, will. All this finds its consummation in Christ, the perfect Man, showing in His person the redintegration of the scattered elements of manhood.

Christianity emphasizes that Christ the light of the world of men is the light of the world of nature.

Christ's birth is the central event of the story of the world, and is the crown of history.

It was a true instinct that led to our present mode of reckoning our years before or after Christ, for all history may be regarded as the preparation for Him or the story of the carrying on of His work. It is this which gives the special interest to Jewish history, "the school of the knowledge of God," and for the Christian no part of its study can be without fruit, bearing as it does on the one supremely important

fact of the world's course. We cannot divide sacred and profane history. That before Christ shows the preparation of each nation to do its work in furthering the knowledge of God, that since Christ the disciplining and perfecting of national characteristics brought under His sway.

Christ is the centre of all—so comes about the irresistible power of religion.

Religion is said not to be much in evidence nowadays, indeed we must confess it is far less a motive power in the lives of men than selfishness or lust, but where a faint strain of it appears it carries all before it. Where there is any religion, that religion inevitably comes first. That is how politicians often mistake their reckoning. They see how little religion men have; they forget that directly that little is touched it sweeps away all other considerations. A slight religious motive will effect what clear reasoning cannot. Its force is out of all proportion to its extent, because Christ is the life of all philosophy, science, social life, and all subserve His purpose.

II. The Church was founded by Christ to carry out in practical working that which is involved in His person, and to realize the difference of function in one corporate whole; our work is to let our thoughts dwell on the question—how is the Church to show herself catholic as Christ is the catholic man? If Christ is the meeting point and crown of religion, history, and science, what is the relation of the Church to thought, to government, to the world?

The Christian Church at Alexandria in the second century offers many striking parallels to the Church of our day. As is London now, Alexandria then was the commercial centre of the world. As a meeting place of all races and religions it approached more nearly to the wide familiarity with all kinds of opinion which the press to-day ensures, than any other part of the Church in any period of her history.

There, as is always the case where the Church has to face free discussion and hostile criticism, she won her greatest triumphs and produced her greatest theologians. A school of Christian instruction grew up under Pantænus and his greater successors, Clement and Origen, and there for the first time we find a systematic course of Christian education carried out. Gregory, surnamed the Wonder-worker, has left us a description of the method of his master, Origen. His first care was to study the character of each pupil, endeavouring to develop endurance, patience, thoroughness. To this end he taught them grammar to make them exact in thought and word.

Next he educated their observing faculties and their sense of beauty. He taught them to look at the fair forms of nature, to study such science as was available, and so to turn blind wonder into rational admiration of the order and grandeur of the world.

Next came moral science. And in teaching his scholars to examine into the feelings and motives which lead men to action, his aim was especially to

be practical, to teach a good life rather than fine theories.

But the training was not finished yet. After a thorough course of logic, physics, ethics, he crowned their knowledge by the greatest of sciences, Theology, based on the study of the Scriptures.

Would that all our Christian teachers of to-day had as thorough a course! Recognizing that no knowledge can be hostile to the truth, he made all arts and sciences stepping-stones to the knowledge of God, so that, says Gregory, "there was no subject forbidden to us. We were allowed to become acquainted with every doctrine, spiritual and civil, divine and human, traversing with all freedom and investigating the whole circle of knowledge." So secure was he that Christian truth was the mistress of, and held the key to, all.

Not unlike was the conception of the Church in the middle ages, especially as shown in the magnificent aims of the mediæval Papacy. Christ, it was argued, had two kingdoms upon earth, the temporal and the spiritual; if Cæsar's things were to be rendered to Cæsar it was because Cæsar was God's representative. The two swords represented the power of the empire for worldly matters and of the Church in spiritual. From that it was but a step to declare the Church supreme, and her power concentrated in the hands of the Pope was considered great enough to dethrone kings and bestow whole countries on whom she would. The conception of the absolute supreme power of Christ's vicar upon earth with all other

offices subservient to it, if time and God's dispensation have shown it to be utterly false, was a magnificent one, and if misinterpreted was based on a very real truth.

And so to-day, people look back with longing eyes to the time when, as they suppose, all arts and sciences were the handmaids of the Church, when the painters portrayed only the life of our Lord and the Saints, when music found its only school in the chants of the sanctuary, when architecture was Christian, when all science and literature came from the monasteries, when the laws of the land were one with canon law. And such people ask, "Don't you think all these things should come in to serve the Church? Should not we worship in noble buildings? Are we to exclude pictures from their walls? Is it not right for the preacher to use illustrations from science, from poetry, to explain or adorn his message? Is it not our duty to press in the best music we can to the service of the sanctuary, to make the most gorgeous and careful ceremonial subserve to the worship of God?"

Certainly. That is the meaning of dedication. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." All things are to be used to minister to Christ, as He is above all things. The Church, as the practical outcome of His will, claims all the resources of the world. Nay more, she makes an absolute claim to teach morals, to guide government, to inspire art, to control commerce, to regulate society, to care for the sick, to provide recreation. In short, her claim

is catholic ; she declares all dedicated to her ; she claims to guide, control, carry on all the departments of human life.

III. This is her claim. How does she carry it out ? As a matter of fact, people ask, "Is it not true that it is only since the Reformation, when the arts and sciences were set free from ecclesiastical restrictions, that they have made their great triumphs ? Has not the Church been notoriously opposed to science ? Has not she allied herself with political despotism in the past ? Has not she been always opposed to freedom of thought ?" On coming to modern times, can we declare that there is no truth in the accusation that ecclesiastically-managed institutions are not by any means the best ; that the presence of clerical members in the direction of a society is certainly no guarantee of business-like or conscientious conduct of affairs ? Are the objections to church-managed almsgiving—that it is arbitrary and leads to hypocrisy and lying—altogether unfounded ? Is there no reason for the popular dislike of so-called "religious" institutions ? Is the revolt so often described in books, so often found in life, against churchiness altogether without justification ? Are not then those people right who argue that the Church should content herself with spiritual duties ; that schools, almsgiving, hospitals, clubs are much better managed apart from the Church ?

To such a question I personally would answer emphatically, No ! More and more as I grow up I

realize that directly any of these things are separated from the Church they *go down*. But are we quite sure that these people (or indeed we ourselves) quite understand what the Church is? When they talk of the Church do they not generally mean *the clergy*? There is one expression, which at the risk of being rude I never allow to pass by in conversation without correcting it. We constantly hear people talking of a man who is ordained as "going into the Church." This mistake is not a trivial matter of words, it involves a serious error of principle. A man enters the Church when he is baptized. The Church is the whole body of christened folk. The clergy are not the Church any more than the House of Commons is the English nation.

There are evils of clericalism undoubtedly, and they are great. But the evils arise from members of the body trespassing beyond the limits of their functions, and assuming to themselves the functions of the whole body. The duty of a priest is priestcraft, as that of a statesman is statecraft, or of a manual worker handicraft. It is not the duty of the clergy to teach science, to run clubs, to organize entertainments, to lead society, but *it is the duty of the Church*. The duty of the clergy is to administer the sacraments, to teach the faith, to conduct public worship, to advise in cases of conscience, but the work of the Church is only bounded by the confines of the universe.

We have got so horribly narrow in our conception of the Church, possibly because though by no means

perfectly done, the work of the clergy is well-nigh the only work done with a sense of the corporate nature of the Church. And as this clerical work has come to be considered the only form of church work, it is carried on in an amateur sort of way by laymen who vaguely feel that they have some duty beyond attending public worship.

We constantly hear people say in connection with church work, "If you want to keep your people you must give them something to do." It is easy, of course, to point out how limited this principle is in power—you can't give more than a small percentage "something to do ;" it is easy, of course, too, to point out how the idea involved in "keeping your people " is offensive to ideas of self-respecting independence, but there is a great truth underlying it. Every member of the Church has something to do ; the whole area of the world's work must be occupied by the Church in the persons of her lay members.

To take one or two examples. It is impossible for the clergy to decide on many moral questions in business and trade ; they have not the technical knowledge, they do not know the ins and outs of the case. What we want, then, is a strong body of lay opinion, a church conscience, struck out by men of business or workmen conscious of their corporate life as members of one body, accustomed to kneeling side by side and to bringing their needs regularly before God. It is not the duty of the clergy to settle strikes, or to organize unions for shop-assistants or societies for domestic servants, but it *is* the duty of the Church.

Some one said to me the other day in conversation that one of the reforms he wished to see in the Church was the institution of popular science lectures. Now in so far as the Church is the teacher of all knowledge, such an idea is a right one ; but such a work would be out of place in the pulpit, would be unfitting work for a priest. Men of science, however, are churchmen, and in their persons it is the duty of the Church to teach science. The precise method, whether parochial, diocesan, or of whatever sort, would settle itself ; but just as the Church in the person of her public schoolmasters teaches elementary education, the same principle might be extended in all branches of knowledge.

Again, no one, I suppose, wishes to see the clergy largely occupied in politics ; a clerical government, even if good in the middle ages, could hardly fail to be disastrous to-day ; but in the person of her lay governors and rulers, to the Church is committed the task of the ordering of the State.

Many of us, however, feel that we are not able or qualified to bear our part in any such branches of church organization. We have no time for politics, we have no knowledge of science, we have no gifts of art, we have no authority in business—what are we to do ?

The Church is the guide of society. Each one has his place in social life, in his relations to his fellow-men. The Church is to present on earth an ideal of social intercourse. You are doing church work, then, when you greet your neighbour with

friendliness ; when you hide the fact that you are tired, bored, or busy, and receive, listen to, or sympathize with your friend. The genial smile, the ready interest in others' pursuits, the effort it costs not to give yourself airs, are all helping the progress of the Church through society. I think we can hardly overvalue the man or woman, without special gifts perhaps, who can show himself good company, enter into sports, amusements, society, help to make things go, and never once lose control over himself or do anything unworthy of the faith he professes.

Christ must touch every department of life, though religious talk need not be dragged in on every occasion. Do not get a narrow idea of the Church. Dedication to God does not mean that all is to be bound, fettered, cramped, and confined to serve an ecclesiastical interest. It is rather consecration, the nerving and inspiring of every department of life with the power of Christ, which alone can make it free.

IV. Here a question arises, What is the bearing of this on Church Reform ? It may be objected : " This is no new thing ; men on all sides are doing this. We find all around us men who are doing their own particular work, serving God in commercial life, pursuing investigations in science, teaching as having a Master themselves, doing their duty in their own God-appointed state of life. Perhaps the recognition that it is for Christ that they are working is not very clear in their minds ; no doubt many fail altogether to take their part in this work of the Church at all.

But is a society necessary in the one case, or will it cure the evil in the other? Why form a Church Reform League?"

Because, we answer, so little work is done with a sense of the corporate nature of our life as churchmen, and so men miss the comfort of "the rampart of our fellows," and because that sense of fellowship in one great work relieves us from the depressing feeling that our efforts are meagre and scrappy. And further, if men *are* conscious that they are living as members of a body, the proper expression of that consciousness as things are now is impossible. Men must feel that working in fellowship they are responsible for the action of the corporate whole; but the sense of responsibility can only go with power to act, and at present the laity have no voice in the administration or share in the government of the Church. To reform so grave an abuse ordinary methods are inadequate; such a deep-seated defect calls for the activity of a special society to press for its remedy.

Modern civilization owes most of its ideas to the Greek race, and among the profoundest is the conviction that freedom means leisure to devote yourself to the public good. This made all the difference between a Greek state and an Oriental kingdom, where liberty meant no more than exemption from burdens. We still to-day hold that a city must be ruled by the active co-operation of free citizens; in the work of expressing its will all the separate trades and professions unite.

Now the Church is a polity of men freed by the truth, with their various duties assigned by the call of God. She, too, must be governed by the uniting of all in common action, if she is to express the Christian conscience bearing witness in every sphere of human life.

We cannot read history without seeing how this was the conception of the primitive Church. Christians regarded themselves as citizens of the free city of God, not as mere subjects under spiritual rulers. "The Church is in the bishop and the bishop in the Church," said Cyprian.¹ In days when the bishop acted through councils and synods of the whole Church, no one could doubt that his action expressed the mind of the community, or that standing at the altar he was the representative of the whole congregation before God ; in days when the bishop was elected by the people they could not help feeling that they were responsible for the action of the Church, and that they shared the burden of upholding her standard of faith and life.

The precise methods by which lay representation should be secured are hard for our lack of experience to formulate, but clearly there should be some way to make it effectual. The lay voice should be heard in parochial organizations necessary for questions of discipline and patronage, and in diocesan councils equally indispensable for the voicing of the conscience of the Church.

We do not define the relations of lay and clerical

¹ Epist. lxvi. 3.

power. We lay down no precise method by which all communicants are to be represented, nor do we forget the still more difficult question of discipline without which all representation would be irresponsible ; but we want clearly to insist that government of the Church should be by the Church, clergy and people alike.

V. Let us hold firm the first principles of our faith. Christ is the catholic man, the crown of religion, the climax of science, the centre of history.

To put into practical effect His mission He has founded a Catholic Church to be the teacher of all philosophy, the inspirer of all work, the guide of all society.

The Church is the whole body of the baptized in which each order of men has its several work, independent of one another, but federated, bound together in Christ by the Holy Spirit.

And while each has his separate and distinct work, all must unite in this communion to carry on its government upon earth.

CHURCH REFORM.

BY THE

REV. LUCIUS G. FRY, M.A.

“And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh ; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions : and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit.”—JOEL ii. 28, 29.

CHURCH Reform in Advent : it may seem to some a strange and incongruous subject to take for such a season. And yet to thoughtful minds there is no incongruity at all, for there is a close connexion between Church Reform and the second coming of Christ : the one is the preparation for—nay, more, it is the hastening on of the other, that hastening for which we plead, each time we say, “Thy kingdom come ;” and when, at the burial of the dead, we pray God to “shortly accomplish the number of His elect, and to hasten His kingdom.”

Now, this ancient prophecy of Joel, which I have taken as my text, is associated in most men’s minds, and rightly so, with the first Whitsun Day or Day of Pentecost ; the Apostle Peter himself, you will remember, took it as his text when he preached his

first Christian sermon on that eventful morning, and from that day to this it has been a frequent text at Whitsuntide.

But the fulfilment of that prophecy was by no means confined to the events of Pentecost. St. Peter himself was careful to say so that very day. What had just happened, he said, was the fulfilment of the promise made by God, centuries before, by the mouth of the prophet Joel ; but the promise, he declared, was not merely for the hundred and twenty that were assembled that morning in the upper chamber—nay, that morning's outpouring was but the beginning of a mighty movement that would extend far and wide ; it was but the first outburst of a great supernatural power that was to come and enter into human society and into individual life, and gradually change the thoughts and characters of mankind, and so transform the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ. Yea, said St. Peter to his hearers, the promise is not to these only, but to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.

And this is a truth that we shall do well always to bear in mind : for we are all of us too apt to think that a divine prophecy refers to one individual circumstance only in the whole course of the world's history, rather than, as is in truth the case, to many circumstances and to many times. For instance, we remember how our Lord was one sabbath day in the synagogue at Nazareth, and how, when He had

read the lesson for that morning's service, He sat down and with all calmness began to say to the congregation, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." It was so of a truth; but the old prophecy that He had read on that occasion was by no means exhausted by the personal mission of the Christ. Nay, to each one of us—so far as we have in us the Spirit of the Master—is the same commission given, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." And in each one of us therefore is the prophecy being fulfilled: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

Even so—just as St. Peter quoted the ancient prophecy of Joel and declared its fulfilment on the day of Pentecost—we, too, at this Advent season, at this period of the world's history, may repeat the prophecy and proclaim, as in the synagogue at Nazareth, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." "And it shall come to pass afterward," or as St. Peter paraphrases it, "it shall come to pass in the last days (saith God) I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy: and

I will show wonders in heaven above and signs in the earth beneath, blood and fire and vapour of smoke ; the sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood, *before the day of the Lord come*, that great and notable day ; and it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

Recognize, then, my brethren, that not merely on that day of Pentecost, eighteen centuries and a half ago, was the Holy Spirit poured forth, but that in the last days, that is, in this new Christian era, this age which precedes the great and notable day of the Lord, God will ever be pouring forth His Spirit ; and this great gift will ever be followed by the same signs and wonders, that followed upon the first great outpouring—prophecy and vision and dreams—different perhaps in outward manifestation and form, but the same in reality and power. Recognize this, and you will at once see the close connexion which exists between Church Reform and the Advent season. You will then be able to understand clearly the real meaning of this present Church Reform movement ; nay, more, it is only by the recognition of this truth that you will be able to understand the meaning of all the great religious and social and civil movements, which have come one after the other in this wonderful nineteenth century, and which have already wrought such amazing changes in human life, and made the world of to-day such an utterly different world to what it was one hundred years ago.

Cast your mind back upon the century that is now so soon to be drawing to a close, and bear in mind the promised outpouring of the Spirit, whose mission is to regenerate the world by inspiring and co-operating with human efforts ; and remember, too, with what sorry material the Spirit has had to deal, with the ignorances, the perversities, the prejudices, the weaknesses, the passions, the follies of mankind—do this, I say, and the whole course of events for the last hundred years becomes plain to you at once ; the history of the century, instead of being a collection of isolated and chaotic events, becomes an intelligible and connected whole : each movement and each event is but the forerunner of the following and the outcome of the preceding.

What a flood of light this throws upon the three great religious movements within the Church of England during the last hundred years ! First, we had, at the beginning of the century, the great Evangelical revival, and though one hundred years have now passed away since it began, yet the force of the movement is by no means exhausted : for it has indelibly ingrained into the English character the intense conviction that personal piety is indispensable to all true life. Then, in the middle of the century, came the great Oxford movement, which gave the necessary complement to the Evangelical revival, by emphasizing the doctrine of “the Church,” the value of sacramental grace, the true principles of church order and government. And side by side with these has spread the Liberal or Social or Broad Church

movement, as men term it, which has helped to give the churchmen of this generation a far more reasonable and intelligent and enlightened conception of the Creator and of His workings, alike in nature and in grace, than was possible a hundred years ago.

But the religious movement has not been confined to the Church of England. Outside her walls we have witnessed the rise and growth of numberless Christian sects—each intent on doing God's service, each eager to raise and save poor fallen men, each striving to make the world better than they found it, each appealing for its authority and guidance to the writings of the New Testament; and yet, at the same time, all differing one from another, each from the rest, and all alike at variance with the dear old Church of England, which is the mother of them all. Here does indeed on the surface appear nothing but a struggling and confused mass of Christianity, a chaos, a babel; but, even here, remembering the promised outpouring of the Holy Spirit, remembering His continuous work of renewal, His signs and wonders, and, at the same time, the hard material on which He has had to work,—even here, I say, all will become clear and simple, even here we shall see the signs of His working. For it is the deficiencies and shortcomings of the Church, the wrongs and abuses that have been allowed to grow up in her system, in the losing hold of the old true catholic and apostolic principles of ecclesiastical government and administration,—the autocracy of individuals, of

bishops, of incumbents, of patrons, of lawyers, of prime ministers, the anomalies in the system of patronage, remnants of feudal times, the withholding of their inherent rights from the faithful laity, the lack of godly discipline in the body corporate—it is these things, coupled, we must not forget, with the perversity and the wilfulness of human nature, that has brought into existence so many religious divisions. And thus, much as we may regret these divisions, and this disunion of Christendom, there has been, in the past, cause for thankfulness and gratitude in the very existence of Nonconformity, for there is hardly one Christian sect that does not bear witness to some truth which needs to be emphasized and kept alive—often to a truth long lost sight of in practice in the Church.

Again, by the side of all these great religious movements, there have come, under the same overruling and inspiring power, the great political and social movements of the century, which have utterly transformed, not merely the very constitution of Parliament itself, but the whole condition of the country as well—and that, we believe, to the promotion of righteousness and justice and to the great benefit of civil and industrial life.

But all these different movements, great and wonderful as they have been, are incomplete in themselves, and are therefore bound, in the orderly course of evolution, to be the forerunners of yet another movement in the old national Church—a movement which will gather up into one, and complete, and

perfect, and consolidate, and extend all that has gone before ; and it is this movement of the future—this movement which is now beginning, this movement which shows itself in a much more emphatic demand for Church Reform—to which large numbers of earnest and eager souls are at this moment turning with expectant faith, confident that herein lies the great hope of the future, viz. the real sanctification of civil life, and the much-to-be-desired reunion of Christendom ; humbly believing, in a word, that it is only by real and thorough Church Reform that Nonconformists will be won back to the mother Church, and Western and Eastern Christianity reunited, and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of the Lord and His Christ.

This, then, is how I would ask you to regard the present Church Reform movement, not as a mere passing phase in church thought, nor as a temporary outburst of savage discontent, nor as a mere means for bettering the lot of the poorer clergy—but as one of a series of movements brought about through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit “in the last days.” And if ever, when you think of it, you feel appalled at the difficulties which have to be encountered, or at the apathy of so many churchmen in this matter of Church Reform, I would remind you of those other great movements in the Church which have preceded this, how unlikely at one time seemed their prospects of success, and how great an opposition they at first encountered from those in authority and high degree ; and then, when

you bear in mind how in every case God's cause triumphed over all difficulties, and over every obstacle placed in its path, you will take courage, and remember that it is "not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Bearing in mind, then, that it is the outpouring of the Holy Spirit "in the last days" on which depends the hope of the present movement, we must ask ourselves on what principles must reform be based, and in what direction should it trend?

For, after all, what is meant by Church Reform? There are, my brethren, two distinct and definite ideas involved in the full meaning of the expression, Church Reform—for the term implies: First, *the doing away with present evils*, wrongs, anomalies, or abuses whatever they be; and, secondly (what is still more important), *the putting once more into form what has got out of form*.

No proposal that is of a fanciful or novel character can ever properly come under the designation of Church Reform. The reform of the Church, it has been said, is not and never can be the inauguration of a new set of ideas; every measure of Church Reform must always be a measure of Church Recovery. Every true advance in the Church is always a going back to first principles. True Christianity always goes back to Christ and His Apostles. The principles which they enunciated were not only the starting-point of the Church, but they are also the goal after which every true church movement, in general and in detail, must strive. In

all that we desire to do therefore, in regard to Church Reform, we are striving to return to the true and original idea of the constitution and government of the Church of Christ.

What, then, do we anticipate as the main outcome of the efforts in this direction? What are the Apostolic principles and practices of the primitive Church that, in the lapse of centuries, have got out of form, but which need to be put into form once more?

In one word, they can be summed up in a fuller revival of corporate life and corporate action in the Church.

And as this affects generally the whole constitution of the Church, so in particular it especially affects the position of the laity. We cannot read the Acts of the Apostles, or any other records of the primitive Church during the first few centuries after Christ, without seeing that the laity occupied in those days a very different position in the management of church affairs, to that which they hold now; for then, it was recognized that the gift of the Spirit was not to the officials of the Church only, but to every member—"Repent and receive Christian baptism," said St. Peter, "and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Just as again, in the administration of confirmation, it is recorded that "then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Hence too, when it became advisable to appoint "seven men of good report," for the oversight of a certain business in the Church at Jerusalem, it naturally fell (under

recognition of the gift of the Spirit) to the lot of the Christian laity to choose who the seven should be : and equally natural was it that the authorities of the Church, *i.e.* the Apostles ordained by Christ, should hand on to those men the Christ-given authority to exercise in His kingdom the office to which, under the Spirit's guidance, they had been called ; and so we read, as the natural manifestation of the Church's corporate life, that the whole multitude, *i.e.* the whole body of Christian people then assembled, chose Stephen and six others, whom they set before the Apostles : "and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them."

This same principle, resulting from the possession by each member of the Church of the gift of the Spirit, was carried out in practice in the primitive Church long after the Apostles had fallen asleep, for the Church in those days was a brotherhood, and each member of the brotherhood had a voice and interest in the brotherhood's affairs ; and most lovely is the picture given us of that brotherhood in those early days at Jerusalem, when "all that believed were together, and had all things common : and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people."

It was only when another spirit—the spirit of the world—crept into the Christian Church, that the

corporate life of the Church to a large extent became impaired, and the lay members of the Church began to lose their rightful share in the Church's action, partly, no doubt, through their own spiritual indolence, partly through love of power on the part of the clergy, partly through lack of education, and partly through the dominance of imperialist and feudal ideas.

What, then, are the rights of the faithful laity, which, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, we may expect to see recovered in this Church Reform movement? Briefly they are five in number: (1) the right to be consulted in the affairs and administration of the Church, in a true constitutional way, in the province, in the diocese, and in the parish, through the Parochial Council, the Diocesan Council, and what is called at present the House of Laymen; (2) the management and control of ecclesiastical finances, both diocesan and parochial; (3) the right to be consulted, in a constitutional method, *i.e.* through their elected representatives, in every clerical appointment, their assent and consent being an indispensable preliminary; (4) the power to remove, by a regular and constitutional process, incapable clergy on equitable terms; and, (5) in a similar, *i.e.* a constitutional, manner the power to restrain arbitrary and sudden alterations of customary ritual, whether in the direction of Rome or in the direction of Geneva.

How long it will take, my brethren, for laymen generally to rise to their high calling in Christ, and—

instead of being content to leave the control of church affairs in the hands of a few officials or clergy, as if they themselves were but babes in Christ—to claim their freedom and privileges as citizens and sons in the kingdom of Christ, who can tell? But of this we may be sure, that in these latter days, before the second Advent, and the establishment of a universal reign of righteousness and peace, we may of a truth expect it; a change must come, not necessarily accompanied with any violent upheaval, perhaps indeed it may come quite gradually and quietly, but come it must, the present feudal system of patronage in the Church must go, and along with it must go the anomaly of the one-man power in the Christian brotherhood; and bishops and clergy and officials must rule and minister as they did in the primitive Church, not as autocrats and lords of God's heritage, but as constitutional pastors and as examples of the flock.

I appeal to you, my brethren, to make yourselves acquainted with what is passing in the minds of earnest churchmen on this great and important subject of Church Reform; ascertain what your fellow-churchmen have been doing in the matter and what efforts they are making, read and study what has been written, help and join the organization of the movement; and this, at least, I can indeed promise you, you shall see, as perhaps you have never seen before, the mind of Christ concerning His kingdom, you shall see what the outpouring of the Spirit is bound to effect in these latter days; and you shall learn, not

merely the secret of a fuller and a freer and a nobler life for yourself, but you shall learn how God means you to behave to your fellow-man, so that when Christ comes again to judge, that is to administer justice in the world, we may, as the Advent collect expresses it, "be found an acceptable people in His sight."

GLORY AND DISCIPLINE.

BY THE

RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF STEPNEY.

“A glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing.”—EPHES. v. 27.

THERE are few sights in history more fascinating than the Church of Jesus Christ, as it first appeared like a new star against the darkness of the heathen world. It is quite true that it was not perfect: nothing which is composed of men and women can, I suppose, be quite perfect here. We hear of contentions even between the chief Apostles; we hear of cases of gross sin among the members; Euodia and Syntyche were presumably not the only women who had to be exhorted to be “of the same mind in the Lord.” But, for all that, the Church of Jesus Christ does shine out upon the page of history like a bright and dazzling Christmas star. There all around was cynicism, and despair of truth, and bad traditions of lust and crime; there all around was a society which condoned immorality and laughed at marriage, which exposed children to die and left its sick slaves to the tender mercies of the temple of Æsculapius:

and yet suddenly there shot into view a society, full of hope, with a high tradition of purity and truth, with an inflexible standard of morality, which looked on marriage as holy, which gathered up the children from the foot of the Lactarian Column where they had been cast and put them into schools, which tended the sick as a sacred duty, and which, after being first laughed at and then persecuted and then patronized, finally conquered the known world. Taken in the mass, and allowing for all failures, and looked at from a distance, it was "a glorious Church, without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." It was a new phenomenon; a miracle in human history; something which makes the thoughtful historian say, what a devout astronomer said of a new discovery in the heavens, "This is indeed a marvellous work of God!"

Now, to any one with the slightest intellectual keenness, it must be a most interesting question, How did it manage to keep its purity? Granted that it was started by a founder of unexampled influence; in the light of what we know of human nature, how did it keep up its zeal, its lofty ideals, and, in spite of a few failures, its wonderfully high practice? What gave it the extraordinary will-power which Marcus Aurelius thought was stupid obstinacy, and Julian the Apostate mistook for empty fanaticism?

And the answer is contained in one word—"By *discipline*." It was a disciplined Church; it had no idea of allowing scandals to shelter comfortably in

its bosom, or letting its sacred mysteries be profaned by the careless or the wanton. And, therefore, merely from the historical point of view, it is of the most priceless importance that the Epistles of St. Paul have been preserved ; for what they do is just this—they give the inner secret of the working of a society which the world at large only saw in its results. And as we study these Epistles it becomes obvious that, kind and loving and philanthropic as the society was, it exercised perpetually the most drastic discipline upon its members, and that it exercised this in its corporate capacity as a united body. Is there a case of gross sin in the community ? it is not to be tolerated for a moment because St. Paul happens to be away : “ I verily, being absent in body but present in spirit, have already, as though I were present, judged him that hath so wrought this thing, in the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together and my spirit with the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus ” (1 Cor. v. 3-5). “ Purge out the old leaven.” “ Put away the wicked man from among yourselves.”

There was no mincing matters in all this ; no weak good nature. “ Fling him out of it,—it is a glorious Church, without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing ; it has to be holy and without blemish.” That it was due to no harshness, but to zeal for the glory of God, may be seen from the fact that the moment the sinner repents, there comes a loving message “ lest

he be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow ;" but it was merely carrying on the discipline of the loving Master Himself, who overthrew the tables of the money changers and the seats of them that sold doves, and would not suffer so much as a vessel to be carried through the temple. Of both it might be said, "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up."

But was this merely an isolated instance, of which it is possible to make too much? Not at all. The awful phrase, "I delivered unto Satan," is used again of Hymenæus and Alexander, "that they might be taught not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. i. 20). The punishment of Ananias and Sapphira shows that the discipline was exercised by other Apostles, and not only by St. Paul; and though these tremendous punishments seem to have been reserved for the authority of an Apostle, yet the whole Church was to exercise discipline as a permanent part of its system. "We command you, brethren, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly." "If any man obeyeth not our word, note that man, that ye have no company with him, to the end that he may be ashamed" (2 Thess. iii. 6, 14).

It dealt with error in doctrine as well as moral flaw. "A man that is heretical after a first and second admonition refuse" (Titus iii. 10) is St. Paul's direction to Titus; and yet Titus was, no doubt, to exercise his discipline with the co-operation of the Church at large, as St. Paul did himself. Timothy is to reprove them that sin in the sight of all, that others also may fear (1 Tim. v. 20). The

Corinthians are not to venture to go to law before the unrighteous, but to bring the matter before the Church (1 Cor. vi. 1-4). If a teacher comes bringing not the doctrine of the Incarnation, St. John says that they are not to entertain him, as an official teacher should be entertained, lest they become "partakers of his evil works" (2 John 10). And it is clear that the whole system was founded, not on their own ideas, but, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, on Christ's own words: "If thy brother sin against thee, go show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the Church: and if he refuse to hear the Church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican" (Matt. xviii. 15-17).

This, then, is the secret of the shining star—it kept its light pure and bright, from within; this is the inner working of the "glorious Church"—it purged out the "old leaven;" this is the secret of the pungent salt which burnt into the world and purified it—it kept its savour.

We turn, then, to the Church of to-day, and the first thing which strikes us is that the pungent brilliancy of the star is gone; it is perhaps less hated than it was, but it is also less passionately loved; it has diffused its influence further, but has lost in concentration. It might be urged that the clear-cut division between the Church and the world

becomes impossible when the Church has to a large extent pulled over to its side the civilized world ; but it is obvious that it has paid too heavy a price for its friendship with the world, if it has lost the brightness of its early glory, or has lowered for the sake of peace its first ideals.

Has it done so ?

Let us answer the question fairly and frankly, without any rhetorical effort to force a contrast, or to minimize the great momentum for good which the grand old Church still wields in the world to-day, with its nineteen centuries of history behind it and its thousand thousands of adherents throughout the world. It is just because it is so grand a Church in origin and history that we ought to long to see it even more "a glorious Church, without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." Has it any spots or wrinkles now ?

(1) Take then, first, our administration of Baptism. Is it not true that Baptism has in many cases degenerated into a mere form ? "My parish," said an East End vicar the other day, "is full of baptized pagans." The idea that admission to the Church is a privilege which involves great responsibilities, and that these responsibilities must not be laid upon a child unless provision is also made for instructing the child as to what they are, and for helping him to fulfil them,—that was the very object of godfathers and godmothers ; and yet how lightly, in the richer classes, do people assume that responsibility, or how commonly do the poorer classes try to do without them altogether !

There may be some in this Church who are god-fathers and godmothers: how often do you pray for your godchildren? What steps are you taking to teach your godchildren or your own children the history of the society into which they have been baptized—its early trials, its glorious traditions, and, above all, the life “holy and without blemish” to which that society stands pledged?

(2) Or take the other great sacrament. We have the apparatus of discipline in the opening rubrics of the Communion Service: “If any man be an open and notorious evil liver, the curate shall advertise him that in any wise he presume not to come to the Lord’s Table;” he has the power to repel him, providing always that notice is given to the bishop within fourteen days.

But must we not recognize that such a discipline flies over the head of most of us? We are not notorious evil liver: the pendulum has so swung round the other way that, as Canon Gore lately pointed out, a mistranslation in the Bible has kept away many who should come to the Holy Table, from fear lest they “should eat and drink their own *damnation* ;” whereas the true translation should be “judgment.” But still, although untouched by the official discipline, are we communicants strict enough with ourselves? Do we realize that, every time we come to the Holy Communion, we pledge ourselves to be working members of a working Church; that we pledge ourselves to be loyal to the truth, not “self-willed” in doctrine any more than conduct; and, above all, to

be missionaries, not to leave it to the clergy to convert the world, whether at home or abroad, but ourselves, men and women,—

“ To bear the people in our hearts,
And love the souls that Christ doth love ” ?

(3) Then again, and one can only deal very shortly with each point in a twenty-minutes sermon—there is the marriage question. Is there not a great confusion to-day between the law of the Church and the law of the State? Personally I am not one of those who desire to see the agelong connexion between Church and State rudely severed, but the most moderate churchman in the world must admit that, if the rules of the Church are to depend upon the regulations of any State, then, “for the sake of life, the Church has lost the object of living.”

She came once into the world to reform the marriage law; she stood in the person of her fore-runner John the Baptist before Herod; she faced Felix in the person of St. Paul; she echoed the words down the ages, “Those whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder;” and it is too much to ask her to alter her teaching to suit the lower views of a later age. Those whom the State divorces let the State remarry if it will; but let the present injustice be removed which compels a clergyman to lend his Church (though not his services) for a purpose which he disapproves, and for a service which he looks on as a mockery.

(4) But let it not be supposed for a moment that it is only the layman who needs again the stringent

discipline of the early Church ; it is needed equally for us of the clergy.

One always holds one's breath at the thought of what St. Paul would say (not to mention One greater than St. Paul), if he heard of the buying and selling of the cure of souls ; if he glanced down the advertisement columns of some of our papers ; or if he followed the history of certain livings, about five hundred or six hundred in number, constantly bought and sold in the Church of England to-day. "Purge out," he would cry, "the old leaven." "Remove this scandal from among you." The difficulty of doing it would only whet his keenness, and he would wonder at the apathy of "the glorious Church, which was to have no spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing," at having allowed so glaring a scandal for so long.

(5) Or again, the removal of inefficient clergy from the parishes which they are no longer fit to serve. Is the difficulty of effecting this no spot or wrinkle in the Church to-day ? Why, it is the secret of half the indifference of the working men to religion, and more than half the infidelity !

And yet there is one efficient remedy which we might use, if we were in earnest to remove it. A compulsory Clergy Pension Fund, to which from our early days we must all contribute, to be supplemented by the freewill offerings of the laity and the richer clergy (almost certain to be given to a workable scheme), and upon which we should all be obliged to retire when incapable of carrying on our work,—

this, if established even to-day, would in time do the work which the "Clergy Pensions Society" is trying so nobly to do on the voluntary system, but failing to do because it is voluntary; and the establishment of such a system would remove one of the greatest obstacles to the progress of the Church in England to-day.

But it is time for me to stop: the increase of the bishop's power to reject unfit men who are presented to him for appointment to livings; the establishment of some check on the parish priest's power to alter at his will the whole ritual of a parish church, a power which was shown at the Church Congress by the chancellor of a diocese to be practically uncontrollable by the bishop; the granting of some voice to the people in the choice of the pastor to whom they are to look for guidance for perhaps twenty or thirty years,—all these things should occupy the attention of those who are really in earnest to restore the Church to its old ideals, but we must pass them over for one final word.

Is all this an impossible ideal? Is it impossible to work a system where the workers are paid only a living wage, where there is strict discipline among them, where there is no "freehold" property to hamper work, and where every fund is closely scrutinized so as to go only where the work is wanted? It is precisely the system under which the two hundred workers live and work in East London who are supported by the East London Church Fund.¹

¹ The offertory in St. Peter's, Eaton Square, at this service was given to this fund.

What the Church in East London would be without them, it is impossible to say. Humanly speaking, hard as its struggle is now, it would then have a hopeless task. Working among 1,700,000 people, with many parishes of 10,000 people, with only, in such a deanery as Spitalfields, 1·7 per thousand of the population confirmed, what could the single parish priest do among so many, unless this fund could send to his help at least one curate? With our utmost efforts, we have only at present one clergyman to 3000 of the population, and, to pay this army of workers for the current year, £2000 is needed in the next fortnight.

To maintain this fund and to work it is a sleepless anxiety to the Bishop of East London, and I pray you not to let it suffer on this one opportunity in the year you have to help it, because of my fulfilment of a long promise to the Church Reform League.

As a matter of fact, the two subjects lie very close together: we shall never win East London without men to win it; and those men will never win the working men while there are things in the Church which are palpably wrong, and which those who seek to commend the Church to them cannot deny. Let work and reform go together, and then it is merely a question of time before "a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle," will claim as her next triumph the pagan districts of Spitalfields and Whitechapel, and the kingdom of East London pass into the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.

WHEAT AND TARES.

BY THE

REV. A. ROBERTSON, D.D.

“And of his kingdom there shall be no end.”—LUKE i. 33.

THE birth of our Saviour Jesus Christ¹ is heralded in Scripture as the new birth of mankind. From the first man Adam descended the heritage indeed of a noble destiny, of the image of God in the creature, of a godlike ascendancy over the world of life and matter, a godlike power of intercourse with its Creator; but the destiny frustrated, the image marred beyond recognition, enslavement to the world taking the place of ascendancy over it, the communion of man with his Creator degraded, parodied, intercepted; enough of nobleness and beauty visible in a world of sin and violence to remind man of what might have been. And now, at last, the great deliverance, to which the chosen prophets of God had been trained to look forward, has come; the glorious ideal of a divine kingdom on earth, of which the kingdom of David had bequeathed the

¹ This sermon was preached on St. Stephen's Day.

hope rather than the concrete image, is ripe for establishment, man is created afresh in the likeness of God, the new humanity is born.

After nineteen hundred Christmas Days we look at the result, and our feelings are not unmingled. At first sight the course of this world seems hardly to have changed for the better, the message of the birth of a new humanity sounds like a satire, if what we see is all. And if we are bidden to narrow down our range of vision from the race of mankind to the circle of the professed members of Christ's body, even then the more we learn of the Church's life, both in the present and in the past, the more sadly do we realize that there also the image of God is still sullied and marred, the reign of Christ by no means always, nor often evidently, victorious over the wilful lawlessness of man. Holiness and Christian zeal we see everywhere and always in some degree, but always and everywhere in difficulty, matched against heavy odds ; against opposition from without of course, but, more strangely, against privilege, power, wealth, and abuses consecrated by custom within. Worse than this, it has often been the case that zeal for Christian holiness has collided with other equally vital instincts of the Church, and has led to culpable breaches of unity. The puritan schisms of Montanus, Novatian, Donatus in the early Church, are all examples of this. The leaders of these schisms were not so much advocates of Church Reform as men anxious to retain a strictness which was giving way ; they feared that as the Church developed from a small voluntary society

towards a great all-embracing organization, she would abandon that note of holiness which was the goal and crown of her other notes. And in their anxiety they forgot that Christ Himself had foreseen and foretold how His net would include bad fish as well as good, and had commanded to let wheat and tares grow together until the harvest. Yes, if we look for the visible, the self-evident and complete result of the first Christmas Day, for "the kingdom of God come with power," we must not look on this side the grave, but must look for the time when "Jesus comes in His kingdom," when "He shall send His angels and gather out of His kingdom all things that cause scandals, and all them that do iniquity," and when "the righteous shall shine out as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

Christ is reigning now, but His enemies are not yet made the footstool of His feet, His kingdom still contains "all the scandals, and them that do iniquity ;" for the realization of the kingdom of God, the Father's kingdom, we are bidden to look forward to the mysterious time of the "redemption of the body," the destruction of death, the "regeneration," the "unveiling—the glory—of the sons of God."

Yet Christ *is* reigning now, and the work of His reign is to bring His enemies under His footstool, to make men sons of God through fellowship with Him, to renew the divine life in men who have lost it and who need it. And the Church is the instrument of His kingdom and of its work. And if she is to be the effectual and worthy instrument of the kingdom

of Christ, she must be purified by discipline and will not seldom need reform.

Here, then, is our difficulty ; to press for discipline in the interest of the Church's holiness is to risk rooting up the wheat with the tares ; while if we contentedly allow the tares to grow till the harvest, we allow the work of Christ's kingdom to suffer by our easy tolerance or apathetic neglect. The difficulty is a real one, and it has asserted itself again and again in church history. Never, for example, did the Church cry out more loudly for reform than in the last two centuries of the middle ages. Reforming movements arose without number, some breaking through the limits of church unity, some working entirely within them. A wealthy hierarchy and a clergy widely tainted with avarice led the Waldenses and the reforming Franciscans to appeal to the "law of Christ," meaning the law of apostolic poverty, and to assert even to a Donatist extreme the nullity of an unholy ministry ; other "Spiritual Franciscans" saw in the corruptions of the papal court the fulfilment of apocalyptic prophecy, while imperialist churchmen, like Dante at the beginning or Occam in the middle of the fourteenth century, suspected or openly questioned the divine title of the papal system itself. Then, not to speak of the bolder movements of Wyclif and Huss, came the movement of the great reforming councils, Pisa, Constance, Basel, convinced that the true constitution of the Church had come to be infringed and needed to be restored, bent on reforming the Church in her head and members, and

yet half-hearted in their enterprise, and doomed to accomplish nothing. Nothing except, perhaps, to unsettle men's confidence in the existing order of things, and so to prepare for a mightier convulsion to follow, which, in many lands at least, rooted up tares and wheat with little discrimination, and brought reaction too surely in its train. A great churchman of the time could only confess that reform was "necessary, but not possible."

The history of Church Discipline and Church Reform is certainly of a kind to inspire caution and sobriety in those who take it in hand. A searching discipline extending to individuals, possible in the small societies which composed the primitive Church, has been less and less possible in later times, and no portion of the Catholic Church now attempts it. The compulsory use of confession for example is not such an attempt. The extreme leniency with which it is administered may have its advantages ; but it certainly contrasts sharply with the rigorous discipline of the most ancient times. We are, then, hardly in a position to talk too confidently of restoring the holiness of the Church by reviving primitive church discipline. But there are things we can do. And, above all, whatever practical obstacles bar our path, we may not surrender the holiness of the Church as an ideal, nor fail to forward it by all means in our power. There are limits to the extent to which we can hope to reform the Church. But there is no limit to the extent to which we may reform ourselves. To perfect *our own* personal holiness is no small thing ; to see to it

that our life is a Christian life, our influence a Christian influence, our use of the Church's ordinances and means of grace, a faithful, loyal and fruitful use. Personally and in his private life each one of us can do much, very much. And whatever we may accomplish in the way of reforms in the government or administration of the Church can only bear good fruit if it is the outcome of a renewal of Christian life in the Church's members. On the basis of their self-discipline, and on that alone, can the attempt be ventured to renew the discipline of the body. It was none less than Jesus Himself who could take the scourge of small cords and cast out the money-changers from the temple ; and only if we are like Him may we hope to drive them from His Church. At Constance men found it easier to burn Huss than to purify the lives of the clergy or curb the abuses of prelates and popes, and this fact suggests the explanation of their failure. But it is not for us to dwell complacently on the failures of other days ; rather let us note them for our own warning, and lay our own responsibility the more seriously to heart. We know that we cannot hope to root out all the tares and spare all the wheat, that the attempt to build up the Church from below cannot succeed ; for her holiness is not the mere product of the individual holiness of her members ; embodying as she does the reign of Christ over sinful men, there is need of much patience "until the whole is leavened." But yet there are hindrances to its working, abuses in our institutions which need the scourge of small cords, scandals and grave hindrances

to faith which existing procedure finds it hard to remove, but which a not unattainable reform might make it easier to do away.

It is for us churchmen to aid the working of the leaven of Christ, and to stimulate and further the growth of the wheat without for a moment forgetting the parable of the tares. Upon the foundation stone, Jesus Christ, one and all, laymen as well as clergy, are building, and as we build, so shall we receive. Laymen as well as clergy, laymen even more than clergy ; for if the lessons of the past teach us anything they teach us this, that the laity are the motive power at the back of all successful reform or discipline in the Church. The clergy can do nothing without the laity, the Church's life and force is measured in the last resort, not so much by the zeal and devotion of her clergy as by those of church-people at large. If the laity tolerate abuses, if they care little for the holiness of the Church, or the purity of her administration, then but little will be accomplished in the cause. All are building, clergy and laity alike, some gold and silver and precious stones, some wood, hay, stubble—the Day shall declare it. The kingdom of Christ is the greatest thing that has ever been given to bless sad and sinful mankind ; the Church is charged with its furtherance and diffusion ; the call to the English Church for the furtherance of Christ's kingdom is one which for its richness of opportunity and promise to faithful effort has, I am persuaded, never been equalled before. Only in our Church above all others the call is to lay folk

and clergy alike, and whether this unique call is to draw forth a worthy response depends upon the answer of our Church's laity.

Worldly dignity, comfort, respectability, connexion with the State, are not exactly evils in themselves, but may readily become so. Sixty years ago it might have been asked whether, if these things were swept away, much of the English Church would remain? Now, thank God, we can point to our sister Churches in many lands for an answer; they grow and prosper without any of the artificial supports we enjoy at home. But we, too, must learn to be less and less dependent upon them, less and less the religion merely of the educated and well to do, the natural ally of privilege, the handmaid of a political party. And this will be so more and more as we are bent severally and collectively upon the true end for which we have our being in Jesus Christ, the one end for which the holy Child of Bethlehem was born, for which He lived and died and lives again, and for which Stephen and all the witnesses who have followed in his train have surrendered their all, their very lives—the kingdom of our Saviour which He will one day make the kingdom of His Father, that God may be all in all.

CHRISTIAN JUDGMENT.

BY THE

REV. WILFRID OSBORN, M.A.

“Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?”—I COR.
vi. 2.

ST. PAUL is speaking in this passage to the Christians at Corinth about the best method of settling the disputes which arose from time to time among the members of the Church in that city. He insists, with a burning indignation, on the evil of Christians taking their quarrels to be decided by heathen judges. He tells them that they possessed in their own ranks men who were quite capable of giving decisions themselves, and that therefore it was an indignity to suppose that they must go outside their own circle to get their differences settled. Besides, it amounted to a scandal that Christians should proclaim their differences to all the world. But more than this, Christians had a special judicial office to discharge, in virtue of their membership in the Body of Christ. One day (he tells them) they will have to sit as assessors in the court of the great Judge of all mankind. They will have to assist the Son of Man

at the last day in His task of judging the world. They will have to pronounce sentence even upon the fallen angels—"know ye not that we shall judge angels?"—to say nothing of men and women. If, therefore, they are competent to take part in that great assize when the second Advent of the Saviour arrives, surely they are capable of arranging the matters of dispute in their own body which call for judgment now.

The insistence upon this duty was not a new thing of St. Paul's own invention. In one of Daniel's visions mention is made of "the saints of the Most High taking the kingdom, and judgment being given unto them." And our Lord Himself had expressly promised the Apostles, that, as a reward for faithful service, when the Son of Man should come to sit on the throne of His glory, they also should sit upon twelve thrones, "judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

This may sound at first a strange idea. It may seem to interfere with the work especially entrusted to our Lord Himself by the Father in heaven. It may appear to rank the saints too high—for after all they are but human, they are but the faithful members of the Body of Christ, they cannot be exalted at the expense of their divine Head. And yet it is true: for Holy Scripture tells us that the members of the Body will in that great day be most intimately associated with the Head. The saints will be seated on thrones beside the King of saints Himself, and will assist Him in His judicial work.

He will call them to witness in that day that His judgment is just; they will confirm whatever He says; they will add their voice to His when He pronounces sentence, whatever that sentence may be, whether of acquittal or condemnation.

This is one of those mysteries connected with the great fundamental doctrine of the Judgment, of which we think so seriously in this Advent season: not only that our Judge will be the Son of Man, but that we shall be judged by the human standard set up by the saints of our own and past generations—the best men and women of our own day, the best Christian life of our time. Even the Judge Himself chooses not to do without us: and when the Last Day arrives, it will be “a coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,” not alone but “with all His saints.” Christians will share in His triumph—they will also share in His judgment.

But it is not so much to the last day that our attention is directed by the text, as to the truth that the members of the Christian society have duties to carry out now in this life in virtue of their membership in the Church. They have judicial functions to discharge in the life on this side of the grave which they cannot evade, if they are true to their trust. They have questions to settle, decisions to give, responsibilities to exercise, unless they mean to incur the risk of being unfaithful to the society to which they belong. For every society claims this from its members. It is not merely that we have to be enrolled, but that we have to keep the rules. We

cannot live like a sleeping partner in a great firm, for true religion implies the exercise of spiritual faculties, and the Christian religion above all others demands the performance of duties in return for privileges. Discipline must be maintained throughout the society, and in order to maintain discipline it is necessary that every member should do his part, and if he fails to do this, he must be content to submit to the judgment of the other members. Our Lord Himself did not shrink from driving out of the temple courts, singlehanded, those who were profaning God's house by turning it into a market-house. He exercised His undoubted right as a member of the Jewish Church to remind His fellow-members of their obligation to remember the honour due to God on high. A burning zeal for the glory of the Almighty Father consumed Him, and they accepted His rebuke, even though He was only one and they were many, because they knew they were guilty. They had been taking advantage of their position merely to enrich themselves. They had forgotten the moral duties imposed upon them. They could not keep the first commandment at the expense of the third. So every member of the Church must be jealous for the honour of the Church to which he belongs. Every member must take his share in maintaining that moral and spiritual discipline, without which the body cannot exist in a healthy condition at all.

We go back to the New Testament, and we find there, in what are sometimes called pure primitive gospel times, disciplinary rules which are very far

indeed from being observed amongst us to-day. We find that the maintenance of church order was preached most emphatically, first of all by our Lord, and then by the great organizer of the Church in the first century, St. Paul.

Our Lord followed up His action in the temple courts by laying down the principle of Church discipline in St. Matt. xviii. 15-18.¹ He directs, for the guidance of the great society which He came to found, that the members of the Church are in the last resort to judge offending members of their own body, so that order and faithfulness may be maintained within their ranks. And this principle is further enforced by St. Paul in 1 Tim. v. 19-21.²

When, however, we turn to the condition of things in our branch of the Catholic Church to-day, do we not find, as a fact, that this principle is practically ignored? And yet it is the same Church to-day as then, not another. The same laws hold good to-day as then. The same rules are binding on us now as He laid down then for all time.

¹ "If thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the Church: and if he refuse to hear the Church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican. Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

² "Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses. Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest also may be in fear. I charge thee in the sight of God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality."

1. Is there to-day the discipline that there ought to be amongst the clergy?

It surely ought not to be thought extraordinary or unnatural for the Church to require the ministerial members of its body, who offend against its rules, to submit to discipline and to answer for their conduct. And yet at present this is all but impossible. It is notoriously difficult, as matters at present stand, to remove clergy who fail to discharge their duties. And as this continues to be a scandal and a weakness to the Church, it becomes imperative to ask whether the Church, as a spiritual body, may not fairly be entitled to ask to have entrusted to her the necessary powers for dealing with her own members. Some people would advocate disestablishment as the remedy for the present state of things. But without expressing any opinion on this gigantic question, surely some simpler and speedier method may be found of dealing with the evil. All that is required is that the Church as a body should be given power to exercise that discipline which its divine Founder thought necessary to its existence, and to remove offenders against its own laws.

2. Is there to-day the discipline that there ought to be amongst the laity?

The answer can only be that it is notorious and obvious that discipline is at present almost non-existent. Not to speak now of moral obligations, not to mention the respect due to the Church's law of marriage, take the simplest rules of the Church of England. For instance, the rule that every member

should receive the Holy Communion at least three times a year. This is the minimum standard fixed by our reformed Prayer-book as the one to which members of our reformed Church should conform; and yet so practically obsolete has it become, that to assert that only those who conform to this rule, or at least only those who communicate once a year are to be reckoned as true members of the Church, is vigorously disputed. But surely, while this stands, those who fall short of this rule cannot complain if they forfeit the privileges of full church membership. For privileges in any society involve the discharge of duties. In the last resort those who fail to do their duty in any society or any club are excluded from its ranks. Our Lord was especially careful to give this power to His Church, when He told them that whatever they bound on earth should be bound in heaven, and whatever they loosed on earth should be loosed in heaven.

So, again, St. Paul tells us to withdraw ourselves from the disorderly, to have no company with the disobedient; those who choose their own way after the first and second warning are to be shunned.¹ So strong is St. Paul's language, so vehemently does he insist on the orderly behaviour of members of the Church, that he tells us how he had "delivered unto Satan" two who had made shipwreck of the faith—Hymenæus and Alexander. He had inflicted, that is the severest punishment in his power upon them in this life that they might not make further havoc of

¹ See Rom. xvi. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 14; Titus iii. 10.

the body to which they belonged, and that their souls might be saved at the last.

And so we find our Prayer-book, true to the teaching of Holy Scripture, making express mention in the Communion Service of the restoration of "godly discipline," which it says is "much to be wished." It recognizes that there are obligations binding on all who have been baptized—obligations attaching to clergy and people alike. "If a man will not work, neither let him eat." If a man will not discharge the duties of the Christian body, neither let him enjoy its graces. There are "things of God" as well as "things of Cæsar" of which we must take account. And just as a secular jurisdiction is rightly exercised by the State in matters relating to Cæsar, so surely there must be spiritual jurisdiction exercised by the Church in matters relating to God.

You are asked, then, first of all, to think of these things, and to add to your intercessions a prayer for that reform in our branch of the Church by which at least a minimum of that "godly discipline" may be restored, so that, as in other branches, the Church may have power to deal with its own members, so that its ministers may be real ministers, and its lay people may be genuine churchmen—not in word only but in deed and in truth. And next you are asked to try in your own individual sphere, in your own circle, to raise the tone and to set a high standard of faithful membership in the Christian body, for in doing this you will be doing your part to purify the Body of Christ, and to prepare the way

for the coming of the kingdom of God, and in fact to fulfil your office of "judging the world."

Pray, then, and strive for the spirit of Discipline. Pray for it because it has largely been neglected and slipped out of mind. Strive for it as you hope to be an acceptable people in God's sight when He shall come again to judge us all. Pray and strive for it, because the time is short, and the spots and wrinkles in the Church must all be washed out and smoothed away before the end comes. Remember that the Church has to be presented to Christ at the last—"a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing," like a bride perfectly adorned for her husband. Pray and strive now, that in the end you may be found faithful.

"Short is time, and only time is bleak,
Gauge the exceeding height thou hast to climb.
Long eternity is nigh to seek,
Short is time.

Time is shortening with the wintry rime.
Pray and watch and pray, girt up and meek,
Praying, watching, praying, chime by chime.
Pray by silence, if thou canst not speak.
Time is shortening, pray on till the prime,
Time is shortening—soul, fulfil thy week,
Short is time."

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

RESOLUTIONS OF REPRESENTATIVE CHURCH BODIES ON THE SELF-GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

The Convocation of York. On February 17, 1897, on receiving a report from a committee on church legislation, the Upper House unanimously resolved that—

“The reform of the Houses of Convocation and the legal representation of lay members of the Church should precede any application for a change in the present process of legislation on ecclesiastical matters:

“The question raised in this resolution be referred to the joint committee with an increase of their numbers, and with power to invite the assistance of theological and legal experts.”

On February 16, 1898, the Upper House accepted a resolution of the Bishop of Durham—

“That in view of the possible legal representation of the laity it is desirable to determine what should be the qualification of the persons elected to serve as legal representatives, and what should be the qualification of those who elect them: and that his grace the President be requested to nominate a joint committee to consider and report on the subject before the next group of sessions.”

A similar proposal in the Lower House was referred to the committee already appointed, with a request for a report “at the earliest possible moment.”

The Convocation of Canterbury entered upon the work of

reform by passing a draft canon on January 26, 1897, which would have raised the number of the proctors elected by the clergy from 48 to 118, making them one more than the *ex officio* members and cathedral proctors. The Archbishop forwarded the draft canon to the Crown with a petition that it might be made into a canon, but on February 15, 1898, he was obliged to report to Convocation that the royal consent was withheld, and so matters must remain *in statu quo*.

The Canterbury House of Laymen, on May 13, 1897, passed with only three dissentients this resolution—

“That in the opinion of this House, the Church of England should, saving the supremacy of the Crown and subject to the veto of Parliament, have freedom for self-regulation by means of reformed Convocations, with the assistance, in matters other than the definition or interpretation of the faith and doctrine of the Church, of a representative body or bodies of the faithful laity.”

This was followed up by a motion, carried on February 16, 1898, by 17 to 9—

“That a committee be appointed to consider and report to the House how the freedom for self-regulation referred to in the resolution passed by this House on May 13, 1897, should be exercised, and what steps should be taken with a view to obtain such freedom.”

The York House of Laymen, the same day, February 16, 1898, unanimously agreed—

“That his grace the Archbishop [of York] be requested to confer with his grace of Canterbury with a view to the appointment of a committee (duly representative of the Convocations and Houses of Laymen of both provinces) to consider and report upon the position which the laity should occupy in any scheme for the self-government of the Church.

“That with regard to the resolution passed in both Houses of Convocation, this House is of opinion that it is not desirable to delay legislation on ecclesiastical matters until the reform of Convocation and the legal representation of lay members has been effected.”

Diocesan Conferences. During the autumn of 1897 the following resolutions were passed, in nearly every case with unanimity.

PETERBOROUGH, October 5th.—“That a draft Bill on the lines

proposed by the Church Reform League is entitled to the support of churchmen."

LINCOLN, October 5th.—"That the Church should have freedom for self-regulation—a due constitutional position being secured to 'the Houses of Laymen,' and the Church obtaining (what is granted already to many other recognized public bodies) the power of legislation, controlled by the veto of the Crown and of Parliament."

BATH AND WELLS, October 12th.—"That this conference would welcome any well-conceived measure of Church reform tending to revive the Church's power of self-government, to increase the influence of Convocation, and to give a fuller recognition to the privileges and responsibilities of the Christian laity."

LLANDAFF, October 14th.—"That with a view of securing and hastening an adequate measure of Church reform, organized combination among church-people must take the place of individual effort."

DURHAM, October 20th.—"That in the opinion of this conference, the Church of England should, saving the supremacy of the Crown and subject to the veto of Parliament, have freedom for self-regulation by means of reformed Convocations, together with a representative body or bodies of the laity."

MANCHESTER AND RIPON, both on October 21st.—"That, saving the supremacy of the Crown according to law, and in respect to legislation subject to the veto of Parliament, the Church have freedom for self-government, by means of reformed Houses of Convocation (which shall be thoroughly representative, with power for the Canterbury and York Convocations to sit together if desired), together with a representative body or bodies of the laity."

EXETER, October 22nd.—"That it is much to be desired that the Lower Houses of Convocation should be so reformed as to secure a better representation of the parochial and unbeneficed clergy, and that to the Convocations of the two provinces so reformed, and in consultation with representative bodies of laymen, there should be allowed a reasonable freedom of legislation for the Church, saving always the supremacy of the Crown and subject to the veto of Parliament."

ST. DAVIDS, October 22nd.—A comprehensive resolution which enumerated the following measures to be requisite, viz.—(1) Reform of Convocation; (2) Occasional fusion of the two Convocations for the discussion and framing of legislative proposals; (3) Modification of the arrangements for procuring the consent of the Crown to the enactment of new canons; (4) Legal recognition of the Houses of Laymen as representing the mind of the laity on church legislation; (5) Facilities for obtaining Parliamentary sanction for such proposals as have received the approval of the clergy in their Convocations, the laity in their Houses of Laymen, and the Queen in Council.

YORK, October 26th.—"That this conference is of opinion that the

Houses of both Convocations and the Houses of Laymen should be reformed so as to make them more truly representative of the clergy and the laity respectively, and that the Houses of Laymen should, if possible, be constituted on a legal basis."

HEREFORD, October 26th.—"That this conference believes that the time has come when the Church should secure increased legislative freedom through the provision that any Bill which has passed through both Houses of Convocation and the Houses of Laymen shall become law after having been laid for forty days on the tables of both Houses of Parliament, without any address to reject it being presented during that period."

TRURO, October 29th.—"That this conference cordially approves a larger measure of self-government of the Church in which the laity should have a real share, but in accordance with the accepted principles of the constitution of the Church."

ST. ALBANS, November 2nd.—"That in the interest of the Church of England as a spiritual society, the grave abuses of her national establishment ought to be promptly and thoroughly reformed; and that the cessation from the disestablishment conflict ought to be utilized in order to point the attention of the devout laity, to quicken the public conscience, and to inform the public mind, with a view to preparing the way for cautious and thorough legislation."

APPENDIX B.

THE ADDRESS OF THE BISHOP OF DURHAM,

delivered to his Diocesan Conference on October 20, 1897.

TOWARDS the close of 1885 a memorial on Church Reform was addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York by resident members of the Senate of the University of Cambridge. It was signed with unparalleled unanimity by the leading representatives of every branch of study and every school of thought in the University, by the Vice-Chancellor and a large majority of the Heads of Houses ; and communications from outside seemed to show that it represented very largely the educated opinion of the country. The memorialists said :

“ Certain definite evils affecting portions of the administration of the Church appear to us to need prompt correction. As examples may be given abuses connected with the sale of patronage, excessive inequalities or anomalies in the distribution of revenues, and difficulties in the way of the removal of criminous and incompetent clerks.

“ But the reform which we believe to be most urgently needed is a more complete development of the constitution and government of the Church, central, diocesan and parochial ; and especially the admission of laymen of all classes, who are *bonâ fide* churchmen, to a substantial share in the control of church affairs.

“ Such a reform as this would, in our opinion, find a cordial welcome from clergymen and laymen of all schools of theology in the Church of England and from the nation at large. It would do no injury to the organization which the Church has inherited from earlier ages, but would rather bring that organization into fuller and more salutary activity, while it would enable provision to be made for meeting with greater elasticity the growing needs of the time.”

Sympathetic answers were received from both Archbishops, and it appeared for a short time that the desires of the memorialists would find a speedy fulfilment. But the debates on Irish Home Rule began soon afterwards. These engrossed public attention and the memorial was forgotten.

Now again the same questions have come to the front. Meanwhile, in the last eleven years, something has been accomplished towards the correction of ecclesiastical abuses. The Clergy Discipline Act of 1892 has removed the worst scandals as to criminous clerks. Successive Patronage Bills have received general support, and though they have been defeated by the opposition of a resolute minority there can be no doubt, I think, that their main provisions will before long become law. But the discussions on these measures have made it evident that Parliament, as it is now constituted, is not able to deal effectually in ordinary debate with questions of church reform. It no longer represents church feeling and has not time for ecclesiastical legislation. The Church itself must obtain the power of self-government, with due safeguards for the rights of the State in accordance with the principles of the constitution, if it is to be freed from the evils which still impair the efficiency of its work. There is nothing unprecedented in such a claim. The self-government of the Established Church of Scotland justifies the extension of like power to the Church of England.

It is then, I believe, to the obtaining of this reasonable self-government that our efforts must be directed now rather than to any series of reforms in detail. And here the preliminary condition is to secure an adequate representation of the whole Church through which its mind can be authoritatively expressed. To quote the words of a resolution passed last February by both Houses of the Convocation of York, "the reform of the Houses of Convocation and

the legal representation of lay members of the Church should precede any application for a change in the present process of legislation on ecclesiastical matters." If this fundamental reform can be effected, there are satisfactory precedents for legislation through reports of such representative bodies laid upon the table of the House.

How then can such representative bodies as we require be established? It is comparatively easy to make Convocation thoroughly representative of the clergy. It already includes, in addition to the diocesan bishops, a representation of the presbyters, however imperfect this may be both in regard to the electorate and in regard to the number of representatives; and there is no constitutional difficulty in enlarging both so as to meet the just requirements of reformers. It is far otherwise with the adequate representation of the laity. This measure involves many difficult and undetermined questions, though the formation of Houses of Laymen has, in a certain degree, prepared the way for dealing with them. Some of these questions we approach to-day. What, for example, is to be the qualification for the church franchise and what for office? Baptism, or Confirmation, or Holy Communion, or Baptism with a written declaration of *bonâ fide* churchmanship? Are women to have the franchise as well as men, and to be eligible at least for some offices, such as membership of Parochial Councils? Is the election to be in all cases direct by the whole electorate, or by the Parochial Councils for the Diocesan Council, and by the Diocesan Councils for the Provincial Council? Shall some members in each Council hold their places *ex officio*? Is the voting to be *per capita* or by orders? What is to be the limitation of subjects on which each body will have authority? And what is the relation of their authority to that of the Ordinary?

All these and other like questions require full and careful

investigation; and in the end we must be prepared to subordinate gladly private opinions to the general sense of churchmen. Substantial agreement is essential to effective influence. If we are divided it is in vain to look for the help of Parliament; but if we are agreed, and propose, with the general approval of churchmen, a scheme which will secure for the laity—the majority of the nation—their proper place in the administration of the National Church in connection with Convocation, I believe that the justice of Parliament will give it legal authority. And when a body fully and fairly representative of the whole Church has once been recognized I am sanguine enough to hold, as I have already said, that a form of self-government will be conceded to us, in which the rights of Parliament as the guardian of the prerogatives of the State, and of churchmen as the trustees of a great religious inheritance, will be equally preserved. It is for this then we ought to work tentatively and patiently, sparing no effort to obtain the co-operation and judgment of churchmen of all classes and all schools. There will indeed be need of great self-restraint and watchfulness and consideration, but each step forward will increase the vigour of the Church and its legitimate influence upon Parliament.

I do not wish, on this occasion, to pursue in detail any of the questions which I have raised, or to prejudge the decisions of the Conference. I shall, I think, do better service if I offer some general remarks on the whole problem and show, if only in a rapid outline, (1) that the discussion of the problem is opportune at the present time; (2) that the organization at which we aim corresponds with precedents in the New Testament and in the early Church, and is involved in the essential idea of Christianity; (3) that the judgment of the whole Church, clergy and laity together, has been effective in the past; (4) that the active

participation of the laity in ecclesiastical affairs has been hindered among us by intelligible and transitory causes; (5) and finally that the circumstances of the present time call urgently for its renewal.

1. The time, I say, is opportune for the discussion. We are growing familiar with the conception and the conditions of corporate life. We have learnt to recognize the action of one vital force which manifests itself in various forms, all of which contribute to the energy of the one body. We feel practically the interdependence of all classes and of all members of human society. Each individual is able to contribute something which is essential to the complete well-being of his class, each class to contribute something to the nation, and each nation something to the race. If any part is inactive or self-absorbed the life of the whole is impaired, and at the same time it is no less clear that the life of the whole is more than the mere aggregate of the lives of the parts. These lessons of the last century bring home to us the true ideal of the Church as a divine Body, a living Temple, of which each fragment in due measure furthers the growth of the whole. Whatever diversities there may be of gifts, ministrations, workings, all are alike manifestations of the one Spirit active for the universal good. In every variety of subordination there is still the opportunity for free co-operation.

2. This idea finds the clearest expression in the records of the New Testament and in the history of the early Church. If we look to these we see that the Christian society moves all together. The laity have their appropriate share in questions of ecclesiastical organization, of discipline, of doctrine. The "brethren" took part in the appointment of an apostle in the place of Judas (Acts i. 15). "The whole multitude" chose the seven, and "set them before the Apostles," who laid their hands on them (Acts vi. 5, f.).

St. Paul associates the members of the Corinthian Church with himself in the sentence on the offender among them (1 Cor. v. 3, ff.), and in his forgiveness (2 Cor. ii. 10). When he addresses to the churches of Galatia the sternest of his epistles he unites in his salutation "all the brethren who were with him" (Gal. i. 2). Though it appears that the question of the circumcision of the Gentiles was discussed at Jerusalem by "the apostles and elders" (Acts xv. 2, 6; *conf.* 23), "the whole Church" joined in the final decision (Acts xv. 22).

All this lies in the very constitution of the Christian Church. The outpouring of the Spirit "upon all flesh," of which the Church was the first fruits, was the characteristic of the New Dispensation (Acts. ii. 16, ff.). The Spirit of life was breathed on the representatives of the whole Church on Easter Day. The Spirit was sent in Christ's Name on the representatives of the whole Church on Pentecost. Everywhere in the New Testament the whole body of the Church is assumed to be endowed with the Holy Spirit. St. John, writing to Christians generally, says: "Ye have an anointing from the Holy One and ye know all things" (1 John ii. 20); "the anointing which ye received abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you" (1 John ii. 27; *conf.* Eph. i. 17; Gal. iv. 19).

There was indeed from the first a distinction between the endowments and the functions of the ministry and of the people, but both had spiritual duties to fulfil; and, in fact, the ministers were set for the training of "the saints"—the body of the faithful—unto their work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ (Eph. iv. 11, f.).

This apostolic conception of the spiritual endowment of all the members of Christ's body ruled the life of the early Church. Not a few of the Fathers of the first three centuries were laymen: Origen, the greatest of them all, was not

ordained till late in life. The general feeling found expression in the familiar and memorable words of Cyprian, who did more, perhaps, than any other man to fix the lines of ecclesiastical organization. "I have determined," he writes to presbyters and deacons, "from the beginning of my episcopate to do nothing without your counsel and without the consent of the laity (*plebis*) on my own private opinion." As "'judge in Christ's stead' of disqualifications from communion, propriety of restoration, suitableness for any office . . . [he] felt at all times bound to act on [this] principle. . . ." "It was the Christian *plebes* which to every individual bishop was the fountain of his honour. It was they who by the '*aspiration* of GOD' addressed to him the call to enter on the inheritance of that priesthood and the dispensation of that grace. On them rested also the responsibility and duty of withdrawing from him and his administrations if he were a sinner."

Nor was their action limited to "the application of rules" or to "the investigation of individual cases." "It was Cyprian's purpose to consult them, and a purpose which the Roman clergy strongly supported, not upon the administration of principles in individual cases, but on the formation and enunciation of those principles."¹

3. At the same time, as I have said, there was no confusion of functions. Powers which existed potentially in all believers were concentrated in definite officers for the service of the body. None the less the consent of the laity to the teaching of the appointed ministers was the exercise of a spiritual judgment. Looking back over the history of the Church we see that the power of the Holy Spirit has in fact been exercised with the most momentous consequences silently in some secret way through the corporate life. We owe to the judgment of the whole Church, how first

¹ Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian*, pp. 32, 36, 429, 430.

expressed we cannot tell, and not to councils, the Apostolic and Nicene Creeds as they stand in our Prayer Books and the Canon of Scripture. *Securus judicat orbis*. And here the history of Cyprian illustrates the fatal consequences of the neglect of the principle on which he rightly insisted in his theory of episcopal action. His baptismal councils failed doctrinally, and why? Let me again quote the words of the great leader whose loss presses heavily upon us still:—

“The Councils were neither deficient nor excessive numerically, nor were they created for the sake of their suffrages, nor were they packed. They were under no State pressure. They were not recalcitrating at any State tribunal. The question was a broad one. They were not trying a teacher or judging a leader. They were looking for principles. Seldom could personal elements be so nearly eliminated. Again, they were really representative. Each bishop was the elect of his flock. None of the Councils was senile or too youthful. The members were not drawn from seminary or cloister. They were men of the world, who in a world of freest discussion had become penetrated with Christian ideas: seldom ordained, sometimes not Christianized till late in life. Their chief was one in whom mental and political ability were rarely blended: rarely tempered with holiness, self-discipline, and sweetness.

“Such was that house of bishops. The result it reached was uncharitable, anti-scriptural, uncatholic—and it was unanimous.

“A painful issue. Yet in another respect the moral is for us encouraging. The mischief was silently healed and perfectly. And how? By no counter council—for later decrees merely register the reversal—but by the simple working of the Christian Society. Life corrected the error of thought.

“Is there then no need of Christian assemblies? no hope in them, or of them? Is the Church a polity unique in this sense, that without counsel it can govern itself, without deliberation meet the changing needs of successive centuries? To how great an extent even this may hold true we read in the disappearance of the Cyprianic judgments. Nor can anything be more consonant with our belief in the indwelling Spirit of the Church; nothing more full of comfort as we look on bonds still seemingly inextricable, and on steps as yet irtraceable.

“But nevertheless if no reasonable mind questions the necessity of Councils, in spite of the gloomy moral and doctrinal history of whole centuries of them, may it be the case that their constitution has been incomplete, and that the so early ill success of Cyprian’s Councils in particular was a primæval warning of the defect?

“The Laity were silent. Yet we cannot but deem that it was among them principally that there were in existence and at work those very principles which so soon not only rose to the surface but overruled for the general good the voices of those councillors. . . . Cyprian’s first

view disappeared from his mind. His early pledge was not redeemed. But when we look to the ennobling success of his former Councils, and the collapse of the later ones, rescued only by the sweet grandeur of the man from creating wide disunion, we cannot but think the change disastrous. The course of history affirms this conclusion of Christian reason."¹

4. In spite, however, of this most significant lesson, the voice of the laity, with rare exceptions, has been silent in the great historic Churches for many centuries. It is not difficult to see why this has been so. On the one hand, through the troubles of the times, the range of education was brought within narrow limits and the clergy became almost the sole possessors of the treasures of earlier thought. The laity failed to cultivate the faculties through which, in this respect, their spiritual power could have been made effective.

On the other side the conditions of society, both civil and religious, required the concentration of power in few hands. It was for the common good that positions of authority became centres of dominion. A Papal Church was the correlative to a Holy Roman Empire.

But these conditions have now passed away. Education is more and more widely diffused, and under the pressure of pastoral work it is hard for the clergy to hold their proper place even in the mastery of their own subjects. Authority is required to vindicate itself. It is rightly regarded as a trust to be administered for the development of all and not to be used for the subjection of any.

And though the laity were thus long silent in East and West, the Greek Church, in so many things the witness to primitive truth, retained the memory of their essential endowment. In 1850, thirty-one Greek bishops published a reply to a letter of Pius IX., in which they said: "The Pope is greatly mistaken in supposing that we consider the

¹ Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian*, pp. 425, ff. 431.

ecclesiastical hierarchy to be the guardian of the dogma (of the Church). The case is quite different. The unvarying constancy and unerring truth of Christian dogma does not depend upon any hierarchical order; it is guarded by the totality, by the whole *people* of the Church, which is the Body of Christ.”¹

5. We wish then at length to call into full and ordered activity the gifts of laymen for the government of the Church. And there is the more need that we should do this because we have come to know that the Christian faith deals with the whole sum of human affairs. We must have therefore the benefit of every form of experience if we are to apply the faith rightly to the different problems which are pressed upon us. These all have a spiritual side, and it is to the laity we must look for their solution. The list of subjects proposed for consideration at the late Lambeth Conference illustrates my meaning. Of the eleven subjects two had no peculiar connection with the clergy, *International Arbitration* and *Industrial Problems*. They were submitted to the clergy because it was assumed that they would consider them in the light of the central truth of the Incarnation; but it is obvious that laymen holding the same truth, and quickened by the same Spirit, might be expected to treat both of them more effectively than ecclesiastics, from their larger knowledge of affairs, or at least to contribute fresh elements to their discussion. On three other subjects, *The critical study of Holy Scripture*, *Foreign Missions*, and *The duties of the Church to the Colonies*, the judgment of laymen is of the highest value. We all know, for instance, how much the cause of missions owes to them already: we ask that they should universally acknowledge their obligations in regard to such enterprises and meet their obligations according to their opportunities.

¹ *Russia and the English Church*, by W. T. Birkbeck, vol. i pp. 94, f. I owe this reference to the Bishop of Salisbury.

To speak generally, the full force of the Church will not be brought to bear on the national life till every churchman makes the cause of the Church his own. To this end every churchman must feel that he is in his measure responsible for its success and for its failure. And the sense of responsibility comes with the sense of power. We must concede real authority to those from whom we ask substantial service. One fact alone is sufficient to show the need of that authoritative participation of laymen in the affairs of the Church, for which I plead. No Anglican Church which has been thrown upon its own resources has been able to dispense with it.

But that on which I wish to lay most stress is that the extension of a share in church government to every layman is not simply a provision to meet impending dangers, though wise reforms are the best safeguard against revolutionary changes; it is not simply an effective organization for aggressive work, though the sense of a corporate life multiplies the individual forces of every one who shares it; it is a natural development of life, or rather a resumption of an interrupted development. Even if the establishment of parochial and provincial lay councils does not lead directly, as I believe it will lead, to a legal system of self-government for the Church, it will reveal fellowship and quicken energy and extend co-operation. It will bring to all the parts of a vast society, often isolated and discordant, the consciousness of one duty, one aim, one service. This is what we desire. We desire to realise, under changed conditions, the old ideal, when the national Church, in its assemblies of clergy and laity, first gave expression to the national unity. We desire to enable the national Church to minister to the nation with the fulness of all its spiritual resources, by the consecration of all its members to the pursuit of the common good.

APPENDIX C.

THE SELF-GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH :

being the substance of a speech delivered in the Canterbury House of Laymen, on May 13, 1897, by Wilfred S. De Winton,¹ a member of the House.

(Reprinted by permission from *The Ecclesiastical Gazette*, June, 1897.)

Those who think that "the Church of England should, saving the supremacy of the Crown and subject to the veto of Parliament, have freedom for self-regulation by means of reformed Convocations, together with a representative body or bodies of the laity," have three things to prove before they can hope to convert churchmen to their view.

1. That some such reform is necessary.
2. That such a reform is desirable, and would be effectual.
3. That it is feasible.

1. Perhaps those who do not live in Wales may not realize the imminent danger in which the Church stood two years ago. As one of the ablest, shrewdest, and the calmest of Welshmen, the late Bishop of St. David's, said last year : "Of two things he was quite sure, viz. that the attack would be renewed, and that it would then be aimed,

¹ Member of the Council of the Church Reform League.

not at the Welsh dioceses only, but at the whole Church of England." I do not think we need feel much apprehension if only the active opponents of the Church joined in that attack ; but we must remember that they are reinforced, not only by a large number of nominal churchmen, but by many earnest churchmen who despair of any measures of reform which will either put a stop to the glaring abuses of the sale of patronage (not inaptly termed the "soul market" in the monthly journal of the Liberation Society), or of the unrestricted parson's freehold, ever being carried without disestablishment. Indeed, we must admit, to our shame, how much truth there is in this contention. In 1874 and 1884 Select Committees, in 1878 a Royal Commission, reported in favour of the reform of church patronage, yet nothing has as yet been accomplished. The truth is, we must recognize that an eternal negative in answer to the demand for disestablishment will never quiet the agitation. In Ireland we have found "force is no remedy," and the only answer to a demand for home rule, which would practically mean separation, is a generous measure of local self-government ; in the same way, we shall find the only answer to a demand for separation between Church and State is a generous measure of freedom for self-government in her own internal concerns.

We all know Parliament has no time to attend to church reform ; and, even if it had, could we expect satisfactory results ? Let us think what reforms Archbishop Temple tells us we want. He named at the Oxford House last November four needed reforms, viz. as to (1) patronage transfer ; (2) avoidance of benefices ; (3) laity's voice in the selection of their incumbent ; (4) the same in the church services. Can any one suppose that any reform on these most delicate matters would have a chance of succeeding unless it was acceptable to the great mass of churchmen ?

Yet how can their voice be ascertained? Let us remember the history and fate of the ill-starred Public Worship Regulation Act. It was supported by the whole bench of bishops, with, I think, one exception. It was passed by a magnificent majority in both Houses; yet it completely disappointed its promoters by not "putting down ritualism," and exasperated and strengthened those at whom it was aimed.

How can now the voice of churchmen be heard?

The House of Commons may have fairly claimed to speak for the laity at one time. But in 1707 forty-five Scotch members were admitted, all of them, I presume, Presbyterians. I imagine that questions affecting the Church of England were not expressly reserved for the consideration of English members, owing to either carelessness or the smallness of the number of the Scotchmen admitted—they were not one-tenth of the English members. But in 1828, when the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed, I can only suppose it was the utter Erastianism which then prevailed which accounts for no attempt having been made to restrict the voting on church questions to churchmen. At present, of the 670 members, 72 are Scotch, mostly Presbyterians; 103 Irish, mostly Roman Catholics; while of the 495 English members, a large number are Nonconformists, some Jews, some Agnostics, and recently there was one fire-worshipper. Surely Parliament does not represent churchmen!

Then we come to Convocation. To begin with, one-third of the clergy, viz. the unbeneficed, are wholly unrepresented. Then, taking the six representatives of a normal diocese in the southern province, one is a dean, two are archdeacons, another represents the cathedral chapter (a small corporation, already represented in some cases by a dean and one or more archdeacons). To the beneficed

clergy are given only two representatives. So, to sum up, one-third of the clergy are wholly unrepresented ; while of the representatives, one-half represent no one but themselves, and only one-third are in any true sense representative.

But we have Houses of Laymen. I cannot help thinking that under the best possible system of election the individual members elected would not be widely different from the present members ; but all manners of systems prevail in their election. In some dioceses the original electors are the vestry, *i.e.* ratepayers, churchmen and non-churchmen alike having votes. In some only communicants have votes. In some the election of their representatives in the House of Laymen by the lay members of the Diocesan Conference is conducted by voting papers sent by post, and with as much care and ceremony as the election of proctors in Convocation ; in others it takes place at the fag-end of a meeting, when only few are left, and even they do not seem to take much interest in the election. I do not think we can expect Parliament to consider that the Houses of Laymen as at present elected have a right to speak for the laity of the Church. I do not doubt that if the Houses of Laymen had real power churchmen would take care, even without any radical change in their constitution, that they did represent them.

2. What, then, is the remedy? Surely devolution is the only course. I mean that of empowering a Church body to prepare schemes which, if approved by Her Majesty, may be laid on the tables of the two Houses of Parliament ; and if there is no address from either House within forty days asking Her Majesty to withhold her consent, they should have the force of law. Schemes in this way are passed into law which are prepared by the Charity Commissioners, the Education Department, and many other bodies.

We are familiar with proposals for church legislation in this manner. A Bill on these lines was introduced into Parliament by Bishop Jackson as long ago as 1878, but was not again heard of. Again, last year the Bishop of Winchester prepared a similar measure, but it had two grave defects :

(1) Its scope was restricted to the provision of additional services and to the alteration of rubrics, thus focussing unduly attention upon two matters, one of which is unnecessary, and the other undesirable, at least for the present. Many bishops are of opinion that, provided they use no words but those which are to be found in a concordance of the Bible or Prayer-book, the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act does not interfere with their liberty of compiling additional services. As to rubrics, the introduction of a "not" in the familiar Ornaments Rubric, or the alteration of "North side" into "North end" in another well-known direction, would more surely break up the Church than all the fifty years' agitation of the Liberation Society.

(2) Then, can any one suppose that Parliament would grant such powers to a purely clerical body, and one so little representative even of the clergy? Unless the laity have a voice the scheme is doomed.

"But to give self-governing powers not restricted to compiling services and revising rubrics is surely to grant disestablishment without exacting the price of disendowment," we shall be told.

I am aware if we do not look beyond the borders of England it will be difficult to controvert this assertion. But if we wish to prove that it is not an eternal principle of justice to refuse to pay rates and taxes in support of denominational education, we have only to look outside England to Scotland, where it is wholly paid for out of the rates, and to Ireland, where it is provided out of the taxes. So, if

self-government was to be only bought by disendowment in Ireland, we must remember that in Scotland, where the Church is so thoroughly established by the State that the date and the clauses of the Act of Parliament establishing it can be quoted, freedom from State interference in some respects even greater than that enjoyed by the so-called Free Kirk of Scotland has prevailed in the Established Kirk for over two hundred years; *e.g.* the decisions of the General Assembly of the Free Kirk are open to review by the State Courts, but within its own sphere the decisions of the General Assembly of the Established Kirk are absolute, and the State Courts decline to interfere, on the ground that such interference is *ultra vires*.

“The organization of the Church of Scotland is due to the action of Parliament. Her presbyterian polity, her doctrinal confession, up to some extent her territorial divisions have all been ratified by Parliamentary measures. These cannot be changed by the Church alone, but she possesses full power of administration. She has, for instance, the power of discipline over ministers and members to the utmost extent, and so on.

“The General Assembly can cut and carve Scottish territory pretty much as it pleases, within certain limits. It can establish new presbyteries or change the bounds of existing ones, as it may please. It can divide a presbytery (*i.e.* diocese); it can, with the consent of the heritors (*i.e.* landowners), divide a parish and form a *quoad sacra* (*i.e.* ecclesiastical) parish, and assign to its support a portion of the teinds (*i.e.* tithes) of the original parish.

“The benefices are held *ad vitam aut culpam*.

“At the same time the Assembly, while unable to change this tenure, can deal with a minister for proved inefficiency, and remove him from his parish on this account, when, on ceasing to be the parish minister, he loses his freehold.

Ministerial inefficiency is a recognized reason for the removal of a minister, but in practice it is very difficult to enforce it. What is such efficiency? What might be so to you or me might not be such to a large part of a congregation. Besides, the sympathy among his brother ministers for a helpless, stupid, decent mortal, with the absolute impossibility of his living if deprived of his piece of bread, makes ministers always take charitable views of such matters. Assembly has the legal power of removing the square man out of the round hole."

The above is from a letter written by a well-known Presbyterian minister to me, in answer to my inquiries as to the powers of the Scottish Establishment. Could the Church of England desire greater freedom? Yet this freedom I must once more say, is the freedom of an Established Church in Great Britain.

I think every one will say that the strong point of the Scottish Establishment is the adequate representation of the laity in parish, presbytery, and assembly; yet let me drive home two points:

(1) The franchise is absolutely restricted to communicant members. For one purpose only, viz. that of the election of the parochial ministers, so-called adherents have a vote; but what is an adherent? He is a communicant who is not on the communicants' roll, but who would be added to it if he applied.

(2) Though the laity are admittedly well represented in the General Assembly (of which they form nearly one-half), the members are only indirectly representative of the several parishes, and are elected much as the members of the House of Laymen are with us, so far as that the parish sends members to the presbytery, which, again, elects members of the General Assembly, and are not directly elected, as *e.g.* members of Parliament are.

But, of course, it will be said that we cannot get Parliamentary recognition of Houses of Laymen, which are bodies unknown to the law. Yet in five lines of a draft Bill the Church Reform League shows that this can be done, if Parliament gives to a scheme for lay representation prepared by the Convocations of Canterbury and York the same force that is given to one prepared by the Charity Trustees.

I am aware that several thorny questions have so far been left untouched.

(1) The limits of subjects to which the schemes of the English equivalent of the General Assembly should apply. I must say that the first essential is that recognition should be given to a representative church body to speak for the Church. Then all would be easy. Many subjects would, of course, have to remain for direct Parliamentary legislation—*e.g.* reform of transfer and rights of patronage; but there would be no greater difficulty for reform here than in Scotland. In 1874 reform was easy, as the Government were able to point to votes of the General Assembly approving their action.

(2) Powers of the Lay House. Surely it should be debarred, as is the Canterbury House of Laymen, from defining the faith and doctrine of the Church.

(3) Should the Convocations of York and Canterbury and their Lay Houses sit together? I hope so, but vote by orders.

(4) I hope, as in Ireland, a two-thirds majority of every order would be necessary to carry any scheme for altering the Articles, formularies, or rubrics.

(5) What is a layman? Let Convocations settle this. I only insist, and I hope we shall all agree unanimously, that he is not a mere ratepayer, but at least a baptized person claiming in writing to be a *bonâ fide* churchman;

ratepayers will still have their voice in the Parliamentary veto.

3. Next, is it feasible?

I think so, if we realize that Nonconformists have no monopoly of wrongs to redress or rights to assert.

We may indeed be glad that the opponents of the Church have not done as they did in the time of William III., viz. tried to force Erastian comprehension on her, which now-a-days we should call undenominationalism. Fortunately, they have aimed instead at "liberation," so called, *i.e.* freedom from State patronage and control. Let us take the words out of their mouth. The late Lord Selborne and others have proved that exclusive State patronage is almost, if not entirely, a myth. Why, then, should the Church have exclusive State control?

In 1880 Mr. Childers said at Pontefract:—"I do not see why the Church of England connected with the State should not manage its own internal affairs just as well as the Established Church of Scotland manages its internal affairs, and manages them efficiently and without scandal, and from a business point of view extremely well. I throw this out as one of the questions which, I think, may be talked about, and which possibly may bear fruit before long."

An editorial note in the *Daily Chronicle* of December 24, 1896, said:—"Such movements as those which aim at increasing the self-governing powers of the Church, and especially the powers of the parishioners and the general body of the laity, seem to us as worthy of all commendation."

The *Times*, September 8, 1896, says:—"All well-wishers to the Established Church, all who would dislike to see her made the sport of political experiments or the prey of

sectarian jealousy, will rejoice to see willingness on the part of the Church to reform herself and facilities accorded to her for doing so."

Mr. Gladstone wrote on May 8, 1897 :—"Dear Canon Scott Holland,—You have my confidence, and you have also, such as they are, my sympathy and approval, in tentative efforts for the gradual enlargement of self-governing power in the Church."

With all this testimony before us, I cannot but conclude in the words of a recent speech on this subject of church reform. "It must come about. It is desirable; and because it is desirable it is feasible, if we are in sufficient numbers energetic and enthusiastic in its cause."

APPENDIX D.

THE BISHOP OF ROCHESTER, SIR WALTER PHILLIMORE,
and CANON GORE ON CHURCH REFORM: or speeches
delivered at the annual meeting of the Church Reform
League on May 10, 1897.

(Reprinted by permission from *The Guardian*.)

THE BISHOP OF ROCHESTER as Chairman, said that he
was allowed to read a letter which Canon Scott Holland
had just received from Mr. Gladstone :—

“DEAR CANON SCOTT HOLLAND,

“You have my confidence, and you have also,
such as they are, my sympathy and approval in tentative
efforts for the gradual enlargement of self-governing power
in the Church. I am far from sorry to have belonged
in 1853 to the Cabinet of Lord Aberdeen, which gave
to Convocation its first instalment of free action, a gift
which had been refused by Mr. Walpole on behalf of
the Government of Lord Derby in 1852. Viewing this
with other Church matters as a whole, I am astonished at
the progress made in the last fifty years, and am convinced
that many a ‘convert’ would have been arrested on the
brink of his change could he have been endowed with a
prophetic vision of what was to come. It also excites a

lively thankfulness to observe that all this progress has been attended with a marked improvement of feeling as between Church and Nonconformists.

“Yours sincerely,

“W. E. GLADSTONE.”

The Bishop, continuing, said the pleasure of occupying the chair was enhanced in one sense, and greatly enhanced, but also in another sense somewhat qualified, by the fact that, as nearly the junior bishop of the province, he was supported on his right by several members of the right reverend bench. “I am quite sure that we, home bishops and bishops who look at us with a friendly and affectionate sympathy from beyond the seas, express a very widespread and warm feeling in the episcopate for this cause. How that should be expressed is a matter of variety of opinion. I myself thought well to decline an office in the League when it was very kindly offered to me. But such things are small matters; and I desire to express what I know to be the fact as to the interest of the bishops generally in church reform. Witness, for example, such things as the recent passage of the Rubrics Bill by the Upper House unanimously, such again as the immense pains bestowed by our late beloved Archbishop and by the present Primate upon the measures for reform as to benefices, and such again as the reference, in more than one diocese, of the proposals of this league to the judgment of churchmen. Then as to the society, I do rejoice unfeignedly (or I should not be here) over its existence. I do so, because it exists to stimulate, focus, and clarify opinion on this great subject; and this is, I think, exactly what we want. We don’t want machinery, resolutions, Bills, and Commissions of Reform. We have these, and have had them for years. What we want is steam. To get up steam, that I take it is

the task of this society. It is, as I have already said in words which you have kindly printed, a hard task and a long one. The *vis inertiae*, the interests, and the critics are always a formidable combination in a matter where the motive power of action is all to be sought from the primary motives unhelped—from nothing but real desire and zeal for the setting forward of God's work, for the strengthening of the Church, and for the good of men. And therefore it is that I feel so earnestly the hope which I have ventured to express that you would 'lay your plans and conduct your operations so as to win gradually an increasing support from the great body of church opinion.' You have, indeed, to wake us up; and may and must look upon the mass of your fellow-churchmen as in this matter unconverted or half-converted men, and therefore men of languid interest and zeal. There will, therefore, be room and need for clear, strong, and searching expositions of principles. Only so are great causes set forward. You must make men think if you are to make them feel. But along with this ideal exposition you must show in your practical proposals that you realize how little ideals admit of perfect or sudden embodiments, that you remember history, and that you are mindful of things as they are, and not only as they should be, or might have been. In this spirit you seem to me to have made your beginnings. Continue in it, and I believe you will find the result in a quiet transformation of opinion; it will perhaps be too unconscious of itself to repay to you all the credit you will deserve; but it will be itself your best reward. Then as to the subject itself—that portion of the whole subject which is before us to-day—the self-government of the Church. I wish to stand out of the way of the speakers, and not to trench upon their ground. But possibly it is fitting that, speaking from the chair, I should just give a hint or two upon perspective in the treatment of

the matter. What is meant by the self-government of the Church is, I think, first, freedom of the spirituality to act for itself in spirituals, and then, as the most important sub-section of the matter, recognition of the whole company of men within the covenant, the faithful people, the Spirit-bearing body, as being in some true sense part of the spirituality. There are other sub-sections, such as that which concerns a better representation of the clergy; but these, I think, are the two capital matters. Now as to the first, the self-government, if you wish to deal fairly, analyse the elements of the apathy or opposition which you encounter. Allow for indifference to matters of the kind, for the politician's dread of *imperia in imperio*, for the lawyer's suspicion of a rival and aggressive profession, for the fear (in the light of history, surely not an empty fear) which many have for ecclesiasticism. But then recognize something more, more or less consciously present in the minds of many. I mean this. The Church of England, if Providence' guiding be with her at all, has been guided to combine an adherence to the abiding faith with a great and even venturesome freedom of individual expression and thought, and men fear the heavy and undiscerning hand of more free Church power. The Church, again, has been led to the difficult task of keeping within a unity of organization and life not a little of the two sides into which controversy and corruption split the simplicity of the faith: the side of mediæval accentuation and exaggeration in doctrine and ceremony and the side of negative protest; and men ask themselves—what would have been the effect on this of a free action of majorities? They feel (and are they quite wrong?) that the very absence of the self-governing power has served, perhaps providentially served, the purpose of a safeguard. The framework of habit and the formularies has held together a unity which in the tumultuous times of

the first revival of life in the Church might have been rent by party hands. This is true. Even now the work of giving freedom must be a work of faith and hope, and find in these its security. But the experience of the free sister churches of our communion over seas beckons now to confidence, and the years have brought to ourselves the experience of united effort, united work, united defence. The true unity is a unity of life, of spiritual life. In gaining more of that by God's blessing we have been making ready for the use of whatever self-government we may be able to attain. The revival of the Convocations, the increase of public interest in their work, the creation of the Houses of Laymen, diocesan and ruridecanal conferences of clergy and laity, the Church Congresses, make a half-century record whose significance we may easily underrate. Even now we may be content to 'hasten slowly,' accomplishing meanwhile part of our duty if we maintain with constant and increasing distinctness that the only Establishment which churchmen can defend or endure is one which recognizes that the Church, in treaty and alliance with the State and bound, while they stand, by the terms of that treaty, is a spiritual body with a life, a discipline, a responsibility of her own. And then as to the place of the laity. The defects of lay churchmanship amongst us are not matters of a single cause, nor, therefore, of a single remedy. How great those defects are, how much aloofness and indifference to the Church's principles and work, how much conventional half-patronizing attachment, how little glow of thankfulness for the privileges and graces of church membership there is amongst us, we must not disguise. Lay voices, such as spoke at Shrewsbury, forbid us to do so. Do not fancy that you will change all this by merely offering to our laymen an extended franchise. The causes are too various and too deep. You must look for them in much incredulity

and more uneasiness about the Christian fundamentals, in the materializing influences of modern life, especially during a time of peace and wealth, in the spiritual malaria caused by low moral standards and by great areas around us of immoral life. It must be met by the whole spiritual effort of the Church in prayer, and work, and testimony, and by nothing less; and the amount of it gives the measure of the weakness and faithlessness of that effort. But what we do say in the present connection is, that one way to quicken loyalty is to appeal to it; one way to create a high standard is to assume it. One way to call out energy is to create channels for its use, and to offer problems for its attack; one way to strengthen the loyalties of membership is to embody and exhibit in constitutional forms the claims and dependence of the body upon its members."

SIR WALTER PHILLIMORE,—“My lord Bishop, I am here to-night partly because you are in the chair, partly in compliance with the request of friends whom I honour and act with, and partly because, without committing myself to all the terms of this League, to which I do not belong, its general objects could not but attract my sympathy. Now that I am here I may perhaps serve one useful purpose, that of showing that there are some lawyers who are not jealous of the clergy—or, at any rate (as perhaps on the whole I had better express it), who are not jealous of the powers of the Church. One thing is certain. One need not, perhaps, be prepared to admit that all the disestablished Churches in our colonies and in the United States are but ‘representatives of phantoms which have long since passed away.’ One may be prepared to have even the private heresy that the disestablished condition is, after all, the truest condition for the Church. But, however that may be, we have a useful, valuable, working establishment, and

we want, and everybody in England ought to want, to make that establishment more valuable and to treat it as what an establishment should be—a something which enhances, not a something which limits and compresses and chokes the enterprise of the Church. I suppose that history tells us that nothing becomes more liable to corruption as it goes on than a corporation—and, on the whole, I am inclined to think that a religious corporation, when it is established by the State, has, for various reasons, the greatest chance of becoming corrupted, unless it is from time to time reformed. That has been felt not only in England, but on the Continent; and various spasmodic, almost chaotic attempts, have been made from time to time, with various fortunes, to reform not the Church in her spiritual sense but the outside shell and frame of the Church. Without going to earlier times, shortly after the Reform Bill in England, it was felt that the institutions and power of the established Church in England required reformation, and various attempts, partly successful, partly grotesque failures, partly things which we would give everything to undo at the present day, with regard for instance to the curtailing of our cathedral establishments, were made. Unfortunately, my lord, in this respect your lordship's brethren have been the greatest offenders. They have been so anxious to redress some particular abuse which has cropped up, that they have forgotten that it is more important upon the whole to proceed in the right manner than it is to get rid of the particular abuse. They have been the people who, finding it difficult to revive the spiritual action of the Church, have thought that they had better use the means to their hands, and that they had better call in Parliament to govern than not be governed at all. When I say that I am going to mention three of the most honoured names—names honoured largely in the Church, and names honoured largely

by me individually—it will be seen that I do not attack individuals, but that I point out the unfortunate action of the system. The three names that I am thinking of at this moment are Bishop Blomfield, Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, and the late Archbishop Benson. All three were, at different times, in the habit of rushing to Parliament for the redress of grievances which were obvious; but every time they did it of course they rivetted the yoke of Parliament more tightly upon their necks. The last case is the Clergy Discipline Act of 1894, which was passed with enormous trouble, under threats that it was the last chance, as there was a Conservative Government in power, that the Church would ever have of reforming herself—I venture to say, as badly drawn an Act as you can have, and altogether very unsuitable for the needs of the Church, embodying a most excellent principle, embodying an immense amount of zeal and energy, but very largely misdirected. But now it is utterly impossible to touch it, utterly impossible to reform it, and utterly impossible to reform any other Acts of Parliament because the energy which carried that through—the steam which carried a Bill of that kind through Parliament—cannot be repeated for probably nearly a generation. What do we want? We do not want to do anything which will provoke the legitimate, or even the partially legitimate, susceptibilities of the State or of Nonconformists. We want to put a plain and simple proposal before them. As long as the Church exists as an establishment it must be desirable that it should work as well and as freely as possible. You cannot regulate it; you have tried and you have failed; and it is degrading to the Church, and injures it in itself that it should even try to submit itself to your crucible. By all means keep your hand upon it; by all means keep your veto. Be as suspicious and jealous as you please, but give at least an initial

force to the Convocations and assemblies of the Church, clergy and laity. Let them at least propose; and put yourselves in a position—not of criticising details, but of satisfying yourselves that no injury is done to the legitimate claims of the State and then pass the thing *en bloc*. We know that the necessities of legislation have required this to be done with a great number of other matters. Schemes of the Charity Commissioners, schemes of the Endowed Schools Commissioners, rules of the High Court of Justice, and various other matters with which I need not detain you, of vast importance to the country, touching the life of the citizen in every way, are done in this manner at the present time owing to the partial paralysis of legislation. Adopt the same principle for the Church and you will get rid of that unfortunate system under which some proposal that commends itself, possibly, even to the great body of the episcopal bench is submitted to Parliament to be, as it were, begged of Parliament upon their knees, to be supported with an insolent patronage by people who venture to call themselves ‘friends of the Church,’ and probably, in the long run, to be opposed by a small body of not the most desirable members of the House of Commons. It is in order that this shall be done away with that the Church Reform League’s proposals are, I venture to say, in the main reasonable, and such as ought to commend themselves both to churchmen and to the State; and it is on those grounds that I venture to commend them to this meeting.”

CANON GORE—“I think that it is impossible to doubt that this movement of Church reform is on its legs again, and, for my own part, I was particularly glad to see that, exactly in that part of the Church where Church defence has been most prominent, we have seen also, within the last few days, a special assertion of the necessity of Church reform. I am singularly glad, if I may say so, to see the Bishop of Llandaff,

on this platform ; and I am singularly glad also to have read the account of the meeting at Rhyl a few days ago, because nothing could make more emphatic the truth which has been already alluded to—that church reform is quite certainly the truest and most necessary method of church defence. This particular topic which is before us to-night—the self-government of the Church—is, it seems to me, a question in regard to which it is almost impossible for a sensible man to deny the legitimacy of our standing-ground as a principle. It is one of those questions in regard to which I think that you can go a considerable way if you will banish from your mind for the moment the difficulties, and contemplate only the self-evident necessity of the principle, because things that are quite certainly right and reasonable must, if people sufficiently realize their rightness and their reasonableness, in some way also become feasible. The rightness, I say, of this principle is indisputable. The fact is that all recent investigation of all sorts has served to emphasize the reality of the Church as a visible society or brotherhood of men founded by Christ, and has served to emphasize that this society was intended by our Lord to be endowed with the capacity for self-government. There are disputed texts which have been so much disputed that people entirely overlook what they quite certainly and on all showing mean. The texts about binding and loosing have been disputed till we are tired of the disputes so far as concerns the relation of the clergy to the laity. They have been disputed on the ground of sacerdotalism. Let us for the moment entirely put out of sight that ground. Whatever be the right relation of the clergy to the laity in the Church of Christ, this is quite certain, that those disputed passages of Scripture mean nothing whatever unless they mean that our Lord did intend that His spiritual society should be endowed with a capacity to legislate as

regards what is permissible and what is not, and that that endowment of the spiritual society, the Church, is hers by that indefeasible prerogative which comes from the express will of her Lord. You may read about the matter in the works of the keenest of sacerdotalists, or you may read about it in such a book as has only recently—alas posthumously—emerged from the press, *The Christian Ecclesia*; but, from whatever point of view as regards the position of the clergy you read about these matters, this is quite certain, and all investigation renders it more certain, that the Church is a spiritual society for certain spiritual purposes endowed with the right of self-government. She goes out into the world, and it is quite unmistakable that she is a self-governing society. There is no question at all about that. Read the documents of the New Testament or the documents of the early Church. You see there the Church. She has no kind of jealousy of the State. On the contrary, she views the prerogatives of the State as in the highest degree divine, and she regards the ministers of the State as God's ministers, God's ministers for certain most definite, high, and positive purposes as regards human society. But there can be no question at all about the indefeasible spiritual prerogatives and functions which belong to the Church. From those days to these there has been a chequered history, and the relations of Church and State have passed through almost every possible phase of adjustment. You have a period when the State is jealous of the Church and endeavours to annihilate it. That is the period of persecution. You have a period when the Church endeavours to wield both the swords of divine government, secular and spiritual, herself, and would make the State only a department of the Church. But the different attempts of the one society to annihilate the other broke down before the logic of events. And then you have that peculiarly

interesting attempt with which the Church of England is specially closely associated—I mean the attempt to identify the Church and the Nation of a particular race. The Church and the State are the same society exercising different functions. That is the glorious theory which we identify with the name of Hooker—a theory especially associated with our country and our Church; but, again, a theory which in its obvious implications has broken down. No one could possibly hold it. It involved, of course, that nobody could exercise civil rights who was not a member of the Church. We know that that broke down. It broke down not before any weapon of argument, but before what is stronger than argument, the obvious logic of events. It was on the face of it absurd, and ceased therefore to have practical existence. Now, once again, we are face to face with a situation in which, as Canon Holland has pointed out, the ideal of establishment is by no means impossible. On the contrary, it may be represented as ideal; or, as represented by Sir Walter Phillimore, it may be a matter (and here I confess that I am speaking for myself) about which it is exceedingly difficult to make up one's mind. But, at any rate, it is feasible. But whether establishment is desirable or not—that is, whether the continuance of the present relations of the Church and the State are desirable or not—this, at any rate, has been brought about by the obvious logic of events, that the State must recognize the Church as an independent spiritual society for the fulfilment of certain ends which the State must use, but for which it cannot even dream of legislating in regard to its spiritual functions. That is self-evident. And with the self-evidence of this has emerged also something else—that is, a revival from many quarters and by many channels of the practical self-government of the Church. All those features of our modern church life which have been alluded to by the

chairman—the revival of the activity of Convocation, and then the revival of all those synods and associations and conferences of churchmen which have come about in rural deaneries and parishes and dioceses—are only in embryo the revival of an actual self-governing power in the Church. Side by side with that you have (and this is not the least important feature in the scene) the actual revival of self-government in our colonies and in America. And we know how from those outlying portions of the empire and from the islands beyond the sea there come back as, for example, to the conference which will assemble in a few months, people full of these ideas of self-government, and they at least make evident before our eyes that it is quite a possible and feasible proceeding. Therefore, that all this should come about, and that self-government should not be the practical issue of it, is, it seems to me, to suppose that tendencies can exist in history and yet not reach, more or less, that goal which is their only logical justification. The meaning of all this is that the spiritual society of Christ is again asserting its spiritual functions, and again shaking its great limbs free in order that it may realize what is its own true and essential life. It must come about. It is desirable ; and because it is desirable it is feasible, if we are, in sufficient numbers, energetic and enthusiastic in its cause. We want numbers, and we want that those who fight for this should be well informed and should be sensible. To make it practicable, to make it a reality, it is not only necessary that churchmen should, even immensely more than they are at present, be enthusiastic in this cause ; but it is also essential that we should be sensible. I am not, at the present moment, otherwise than rather depressed about our immediate prospects ; because it seems to me that we want to learn what I may call the instincts of clubbable men about these matters. We do want to learn

self-adjustment and self-suppression, and the capacity for obedience, and for keeping our own particular fads and whims and desires in the background. I should like to mention very briefly three qualities which are essential to us if we would accomplish anything. The first of these qualities is that we should be content to merge details until we are quite clear about our general principles. One knows so well the kind of man who comes into one's room. He says, 'Church reform! Yes. It is an admirable thing, and I am most enthusiastically with you. I propose to join your league.' Then you begin to feel certain that there is something in the background, and it soon appears that the gentleman wrote a pamphlet about the year 1830, or 1860, or 1870, something which had a detailed and elaborate scheme for the reconstitution of the Church on the most desirable lines. It then appears that there is to be no compromise about this scheme. It is to be all or nothing. I think that you all know the sort of gentleman that I have indicated. If we are to do anything we must be content to wait in regard to details, and to come together upon general principles. We should be fools in this league if, at this hour of the day, we thought that we had the scheme by which all could be settled. No; we must be tentative, and we must be content to be tentative for some time to come. Then, secondly, there must be give-and-take, and that specially as between clergy and laity. We know quite well already, those of us who have been trying to interest people in this league, the sort of thing that happens. A clergyman comes into the room, an excellent man, who looks at our scheme, and says, 'Oh, discipline for the laity! An admirable thing; exactly what is needed.' He casts his eye further down the paper, and sees something about allowing the communicant body to have a certain control or check over the abrupt alteration of ritual. 'I think that

that is a mistake,' says he ; 'I should drop that.' A few minutes afterwards a layman comes into the room. Now he happens to begin at the bottom of the paper. He sees the passage about this control or restraint to be exercised by the laity over the abrupt alteration of ritual, and he says, 'That is an admirable thing ; that is what we want. That will give the Church new life.' After a little while he looks to the top, and he sees something about discipline for the laity, and he says, 'That had better be dropped out.' It is quite certain that we must learn to give and take in this matter if we are to make any headway at all. We must acknowledge that if the laity are to exercise fuller functions, we must have some clear definition and some security that the layman is a layman—that is to say, that he is a churchman. On the other hand, we cannot look at history, especially at the earliest and freshest Church, without acknowledging that the laity had an immensely more influential, understood, and recognized place in Church than they have had in later years, through a great number of influences which I will not try to enumerate. Therefore, clearly there must be give and take in this matter ; and there is not the remotest chance of either the one or the other getting it all his own way. We have to recognize this and to be on the watch. If we are to make any progress at all, we must be putting up with what we do not like, always being ready to make compromises which do not reach the point of extinguishing or obscuring any vital or essential principle. Then, lastly, there is a third quality which it is absolutely essential we should have, and that is, that we must be sensible in regard to general principles. It seems to me that nobody can doubt that the vast, the immense, majority of the existing members of the Church of England most earnestly desire that the Church of England should remain firm on those lines upon which it has existed for so many centuries with

that definiteness and with that breadth. The Church of England has taken its stand definitely upon understood principles. It is a Church based on the Creeds; it is a Church with its catechism, with its sacramental means of grace, and it is a Church with its episcopal succession and ordained ministry. It is a Church with its appeal to Scripture. That gives us a certain definite basis which we are always recognized as having in history, and also very large limits within which difference of opinion is allowed. I do not believe that there is any appreciable minority in the Church of England which would desire to have that altered. It would cost too much to attempt to alter it. It would cost too much in whatever direction there might be an attempt to tamper with that which is the great historical position of the Church of England. There is nothing to be afraid of with regard to that. Now, if you say, on the other hand, that it would cost too much to attempt any alteration, then I say that to lead up a Church and allow it to revive its energies, to set on foot every kind of consultative body, to throw upon it vast and new tasks such as have hardly ever been laid upon any spiritual or other society in the world, and then, having led the Church up to all this revived life, all this deliberative organization, and having given it this new vitality and vast scope and these immense duties, to refuse it just that amount of legislative freedom which makes these burdens tolerable and renders it possible for any society to do its work—I say that to do that costs too much.”

February 1898.

A Selection of Works IN THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

London : 39 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

New York : 91 and 93 FIFTH AVENUE.

Bombay : 32 HORNBY ROAD.

Abbey and Overton.—THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By CHARLES J. ABBEY, M.A., Rector of Checkendon, Reading, and JOHN H. OVERTON, D.D., Canon of Lincoln. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Adams.—SACRED ALLEGORIES. The Shadow of the Cross—The Distant Hills—The Old Man's Home—The King's Messengers. By the Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*
The four Allegories may be had separately, with Illustrations. *16mo. 1s. each.*

Aids to the Inner Life.

Edited by the Venble. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A., Archdeacon of Cleveland, Canon of York, Rector of Kirby Misperton, and Rural Dean of Malton. *Five Vols. 32mo, cloth limp, 6d. each; or cloth extra, 1s. each.*

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By THOMAS À KEMPIS.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR

THE DEVOUT LIFE. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL.

THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT. By LAURENCE SCUPOLI.

Barnett.—THE SERVICE OF GOD : Sermons, Essays, and Addresses. By SAMUEL A. BARNETT, Warden of Toynbee Hall, Whitechapel; Canon of Bristol Cathedral; Select Preacher before Oxford University. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

Bathe.—Works by the Rev. ANTHONY BATHE, M.A.

A LENT WITH JESUS. A Plain Guide for Churchmen. Containing Readings for Lent and Easter Week, and on the Holy Eucharist. *32mo, 1s.; or in paper cover, 6d.*

AN ADVENT WITH JESUS. *32mo, 1s.; or in paper cover, 6d.*

WHAT I SHOULD BELIEVE. A Simple Manual of Self-Instruction for Church People. *Small 8vo, limp, 1s.; cloth gilt, 2s.*

Bathe and Buckham.—THE CHRISTIAN'S ROAD BOOK.

2 Parts. By the Rev. ANTHONY BATHE and Rev. F. H. BUCKHAM.

Part I. DEVOTIONS. *Sewed, 6d. ; limp cloth, 1s. ; cloth extra, 1s. 6d.*Part II. READINGS. *Sewed, 1s. ; limp cloth, 2s. ; cloth extra, 3s. ; or complete in one volume, sewed, 1s. 6d. ; limp cloth, 2s. 6d. ; cloth extra, 3s. 6d.***Benson.**—Works by the Rev. R. M. BENSON, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford.THE FINAL PASSOVER: A Series of Meditations upon the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. *Small 8vo.*

Vol. I.—THE REJECTION. 5s.

Vol. II.—THE UPPER CHAMBER.

Part I. 5s.

Part II. 5s.

Vol. III.—THE DIVINE EXODUS.

Parts I. and II. 5s. each.

Vol. IV.—THE LIFE BEYOND THE GRAVE. 5s.

THE MAGNIFICAT; a Series of Meditations upon the Song of the Blessed Virgin Mary. *Small 8vo. 2s.*SPIRITUAL READINGS FOR EVERY DAY. 3 vols. *Small 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.*

I. ADVENT.

II. CHRISTMAS.

III. EPIPHANY.

BENEDICTUS DOMINUS: A Course of Meditations for Every Day of the Year. Vol. I.—ADVENT TO TRINITY. Vol. II.—TRINITY, SAINTS' DAYS, etc. *Small 8vo. 3s. 6d. each ; or in One Volume, 7s.*BIBLE TEACHINGS: The Discourse at Capernaum.—St. John vi. *Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.*THE WISDOM OF THE SON OF DAVID: An Exposition of the First Nine Chapters of the Book of Proverbs. *Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.*THE MANUAL OF INTERCESSORY PRAYER. *Royal 32mo. ; cloth boards, 1s. 3d. ; cloth limp, 9d.*THE EVANGELIST LIBRARY CATECHISM. Part I. *Small 8vo. 3s.*PAROCHIAL MISSIONS. *Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.***Bickersteth.**—YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER:a Poem in Twelve Books. By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, D.D., Bishop of Exeter. *One Shilling Edition, 18mo. With red borders, 16mo, 2s. 6d.**The Crown 8vo Edition (5s.) may still be had.***Blunt.**—Works by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D.

THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER: Being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. 4to. 21s.

THE COMPENDIOUS EDITION OF THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER: Forming a concise Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. *Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.*

Blunt.—Works by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D.—*contd.*

DICTIONARY OF DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

By various Writers. *Imperial 8vo.* 21s.

DICTIONARY OF SECTS, HERESIES, ECCLESIASTICAL PARTIES AND SCHOOLS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By various Writers. *Imperial 8vo.* 21s.

THE REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: its History, Principles, and Results. 1574-1662. *Two Vols.* 8vo. 34s.

THE BOOK OF CHURCH LAW. Being an Exposition of the Legal Rights and Duties of the Parochial Clergy and the Laity of the Church of England. Revised by Sir WALTER G. F. PHILLIMORE, Bart., D.C.L., and G. EDWARDES JONES, Barrister-at-Law. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

A COMPANION TO THE BIBLE: Being a Plain Commentary on Scripture History, to the end of the Apostolic Age. *Two Vols.* *small 8vo.* *Sold separately.*

THE OLD TESTAMENT. 3s. 6d. THE NEW TESTAMENT. 3s. 6d.

HOUSEHOLD THEOLOGY: a Handbook of Religious Information respecting the Holy Bible, the Prayer Book, the Church, etc., etc. *Paper cover, 16mo.* 1s. *Also the Larger Edition, 3s. 6d.*

Body.—Works by the Rev. GEORGE BODY, D.D., Canon of Durham.

THE LIFE OF LOVE. A Course of Lent Lectures. *16mo.* 2s. 6d.

THE SCHOOL OF CALVARY; or, Laws of Christian Life revealed from the Cross. *16mo.* 2s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF JUSTIFICATION. *16mo.* 2s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF TEMPTATION. *16mo.* 2s. 6d.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE FAITHFUL DEPARTED. *Small 8vo. sewed, 6d.* *32mo. cloth, 1s.*

Boulton.—A COMMENTARY ON THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTON, formerly Principal of the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Bright.—Works by WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE ROMAN SEE IN THE EARLY CHURCH: And other Studies in Church History. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

WAYMARKS IN CHURCH HISTORY. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

MORALITY IN DOCTRINE. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

LESSONS FROM THE LIVES OF THREE GREAT FATHERS: St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

THE INCARNATION AS A MOTIVE POWER. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Bright and Medd.—LIBER PRECUM PUBLICARUM ECCLESIAE ANGLICANÆ. A GULIELMO BRIGHT, S.T.P., et PETRO GOLDSMITH MEDD, A.M., Latine redditus. *Small 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Browne.—WEARIED WITH THE BURDEN: A Book of Daily Readings for Lent. By ARTHUR HEBER BROWNE, M.A., LL.D., Rector of St. John's, Newfoundland. *Crown 8vo.* 4s. 6d.

Browne.—AN EXPOSITION OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, Historical and Doctrinal. By E. H. BROWNE, D.D., sometime Bishop of Winchester. *8vo.* 16s.

Campion and Beamont.—THE PRAYER BOOK INTER-LEAVED. With Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes arranged parallel to the Text. By W. M. CAMPION, D.D., and W. J. BEAMONT, M.A. *Small 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Carter.—Works edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE TREASURY OF DEVOTION: a Manual of Prayer for General and Daily Use. Compiled by a Priest.

18mo. 2s. 6d.; *cloth limp*, 2s.

Bound with the Book of Common Prayer, 3s. 6d.

Red-Line Edition. *Cloth extra, gilt top.* *18mo.* 2s. 6d. *net.*

Large-Type Edition. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE WAY OF LIFE: A Book of Prayers and Instruction for the Young at School, with a Preparation for Confirmation. Compiled by a Priest, *18mo.* 1s. 6d.

THE PATH OF HOLINESS: a First Book of Prayers, with the Service of the Holy Communion, for the Young. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. *16mo.* 1s. 6d.; *cloth limp*, 1s.

THE GUIDE TO HEAVEN: a Book of Prayers for every Want. (For the Working Classes.) Compiled by a Priest. *18mo.* 1s. 6d.; *cloth limp*, 1s. *Large-Type Edition.* *Crown 8vo.* 1s. 6d.; *cloth limp*, 1s.

THE STAR OF CHILDHOOD: a First Book of Prayers and Instruction for Children. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. *16mo.* 2s. 6d.

SIMPLE LESSONS; or, Words Easy to be Understood. A Manual of Teaching. I. On the Creed. II. The Ten Commandments. III. The Sacrament. *18mo.* 3s.

A BOOK OF PRIVATE PRAYER FOR MORNING, MID-DAY, AND OTHER TIMES. *18mo. limp cloth*, 1s.; *cloth, red edges*, 1s. 3d.

NICHOLAS FERRAR: his Household and his Friends. With Portrait engraved after a Picture by CORNELIUS JANSSEN at Magdalene College, Cambridge. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN KETTLEWELL. With Details of the History of the Non-Jurors. With Portrait. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

MANUAL OF DEVOTION FOR SISTERS OF MERCY. 8 parts in 2 vols. *32mo.* 10s. Or separately, as follows:—Part I. Prayers for Daily Use, 1s. 6d. Part II. For Different Necessities, 1s. Part III. For Forgiveness of Sins, 1s. Part IV. On the Holy Communion, 2s. Part V. Acts of Adoration, etc., 1s. Part VI. Prayers to our Lord Jesus Christ, 1s. Part VII. Devotions on the Passion. Part VIII. Devotions for the Sick, 1s. 6d.

SHORT OFFICE OF THE HOLY GHOST. *32mo.* 1s.

Conybeare and Howson.—THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A., and the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. With numerous Maps and Illustrations.

LIBRARY EDITION. *Two Vols.* 8vo. 21s. STUDENTS' EDITION. *One Vol.* Crown 8vo. 6s. POPULAR EDITION. *One Vol.* Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Creighton.—A HISTORY OF THE PAPACY FROM THE GREAT SCHISM TO THE SACK OF ROME (1378-1527). By Right Hon. and Right Rev. MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., Lord Bishop of London. *Six volumes,* Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

DAY HOURS (THE) OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Newly Translated and Arranged according to the Prayer Book and the Authorised Translation of the Bible. *Crown 8vo. sewed, 1s. 6d. net: cloth, 2s. net. An Edition on Thicker Paper, sewed, 2s. net; cloth, 2s. 6d. net.*

Devotional Series, 16mo, Red Borders. *Each 2s. 6d.*

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.

CHILCOT'S TREATISE ON EVIL THOUGHTS.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

FRANCIS DE SALES' (ST.) THE DEVOUT LIFE.

HERBERT'S POEMS AND PROVERBS.

KEMPIS' (A) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.

WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Large type.*

*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.

*————— HOLY DYING.

** These two in one Volume. 5s.*

Devotional Series, 18mo, without Red Borders. *Each 1s.*

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

FRANCIS DE SALES' (ST.) THE DEVOUT LIFE.

HERBERT'S POEMS AND PROVERBS.

KEMPIS' (A) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.

WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER, *Large type.*

*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.

*————— HOLY DYING.

** These two in one Volume. 2s. 6d.*

Edersheim.—Works by ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A., D.D., Ph.D.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS THE MESSIAH. *Two Vols.* 8vo. 24s.

JESUS THE MESSIAH: being an Abridged Edition of 'The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.' *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH NATION AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM UNDER TITUS. 8vo. 18s.

Ellicott.—Works by C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester.

A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES. Greek Text, with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary, and a Revised English Translation. 8vo.

I CORINTHIANS. 16s.

GALATIANS. 8s. 6d.

EPHESIANS. 8s. 6d.

PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND

PHILEMON. 10s. 6d.

THESSALONIANS. 7s. 6d.

PASTORAL EPISTLES. 10s. 6d.

HISTORICAL LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. 8vo. 12s.

ENGLISH (THE) CATHOLIC'S VADE MECUM: a Short Manual of General Devotion. Compiled by a PRIEST. 32mo. 1s.

Epochs of Church History.—Edited by Right Hon. and Right Rev. MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., Lord Bishop of London. *Small 8vo.* 2s. 6d. each.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN OTHER LANDS. By the Rev. H. W. TUCKER, M.A.

THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. GEO. G. PERRY, M.A.

THE CHURCH OF THE EARLY FATHERS. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By the Rev. J. H. OVERTON, D.D.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. By the Hon. G. C. BRODRICK, D.C.L.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. By J. BASS MULLINGER, M.A.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By the Rev. W. HUNT, M.A.

THE CHURCH AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE. By the Rev. H. F. TOZER, M.A.

THE CHURCH AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By the Rev. A. CARR, M.A.

THE CHURCH AND THE PURITANS, 1570-1660. By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN, M.A.

HILDEBRAND AND HIS TIMES. By the Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A.

THE POPES AND THE HOHENSTAUFEN. By UGO BALZANI.

THE COUNTER REFORMATION. By ADOLPHUS WILLIAM WARD, Litt. D.

WYCLIFFE AND MOVEMENTS FOR REFORM. By REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A.

THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY. By H. M. GWATKIN, M.A.

EUCHARISTIC MANUAL (THE). Consisting of Instructions and Devotions for the Holy Sacrament of the Altar. From various sources. 32mo. cloth gilt, red edges. 1s. Cheap Edition, limp cloth. 9d.

Farrar.—Works by FREDERICK W. FARRAR, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.

THE BIBLE: Its Meaning and Supremacy. 8vo. 15s.

'ALLEGORIES.' With 25 Illustrations by AMELIA BAUERLE. Crown 8vo. 6s.

CONTENTS.—The Life Story of Aneer—The Choice—The Fortunes of a Royal House—The Basilisk and the Leopard.

Fosbery.—Works edited by the Rev. THOMAS VINCENT FOSBERY, M.A., sometime Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading.

VOICES OF COMFORT. *Cheap Edition. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

The Larger Edition (7s. 6d.) may still be had.

HYMNS AND POEMS FOR THE SICK AND SUFFERING. In connection with the Service for the Visitation of the Sick. Selected from Various Authors. *Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Geikie.—Works by J. CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., LL.D., late Vicar of St. Martin-at-Palace, Norwich.

HOURS WITH THE BIBLE: the Scriptures in the Light of Modern Discovery and Knowledge. *New Edition, largely rewritten. Complete in Twelve Volumes. Crown 8vo. 6s. each.*

OLD TESTAMENT.

In Six Volumes. Sold separately. 6s. each.

CREATION TO THE PATRIARCHS.
With a Map and Illustrations.

REHOBOAM TO HEZEKIAH. *With Illustrations.*

MOSES TO JUDGES. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

MANASSEH TO ZEDEKIAH. *With the Contemporary Prophets. With a Map and Illustrations.*

SAMSON TO SOLOMON. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

EXILE TO MALACHI. *With the Contemporary Prophets. With Illustrations.*

NEW TESTAMENT.

In Six Volumes. Sold separately. 6s. each.

THE GOSPELS. *With a Map and Illustrations.*

LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.
With Maps and Illustrations. 2 vols.

LIFE AND WORDS OF CHRIST.
With Map. 2 vols.

ST. PETER TO REVELATION. *With 29 Illustrations.*

LIFE AND WORDS OF CHRIST.

Cabinet Edition. With Map. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 12s.

Cheap Edition, without the Notes. 1 vol. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A SHORT LIFE OF CHRIST. *With numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

OLD TESTAMENT CHARACTERS. *With many Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

LANDMARKS OF OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

[continued.]

Geikie.—Works by J. CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., LL.D., late Vicar of St. Martin-at-Palace, Norwich—*continued*.

ENTERING ON LIFE. A Book for Young Men. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

THE PRECIOUS PROMISES. *Crown 8vo.* 2s.

BEN AMMI: being the Story of the Life of Lazarus of Bethany, told, reputedly, by Himself. [*Preparing for publication.*]

GOLD DUST: a Collection of Golden Counsels for the Sanctification of Daily Life. Translated from the French. Edited by CHARLOTTE M. YONGE. Parts I. II. III. Small Pocket Volumes. *Cloth, gilt, each* 1s. Parts I. and II. in One Volume. 1s. 6d. Parts I., II., and III. in One Volume. 2s.

* * The two first parts in One Volume, *large type, 18mo. cloth, gilt.* 2s. 6d.

Gore.—Works by the Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., D.D., Canon of Westminster.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. *8vo.* 10s. 6d.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CLAIMS. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

GREAT TRUTHS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

Edited by the Rev. W. U. RICHARDS. *Small 8vo.* 2s.

Hall.—Works by the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.

THE VIRGIN MOTHER: Retreat Addresses on the Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary as told in the Gospels. With an appended Essay on the Virgin Birth of our Lord. *Crown 8vo.* 4s. 6d.

CHRIST'S TEMPTATION AND OURS. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

Harrison.—Works by the Rev. ALEXANDER J. HARRISON, B.D., Lecturer of the Christian Evidence Society.

PROBLEMS OF CHRISTIANITY AND SCEPTICISM. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO SCEPTICS: a Conversational Guide to Evidential Work. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE REPOSE OF FAITH, IN VIEW OF PRESENT DAY DIFFICULTIES. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Hatch.—THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1880. By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D., late Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. *8vo.* 5s.

Heygate.—THE MANUAL: a Book of Devotion. Adapted for General Use. By the Rev. W. E. HEYGATE, M.A., Rector of Brighstone. *18mo. cloth limp, 1s.; boards, 1s. 3d. Cheap Edition, 6d. Small 8vo. Large Type, 1s. 6d.*

Holland.—Works by the Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's.

GOD'S CITY AND THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM. *Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

PLEAS AND CLAIMS FOR CHRIST. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

CREED AND CHARACTER : Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

ON BEHALF OF BELIEF. Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

CHRIST OR ECCLESIASTES. Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

LOGIC AND LIFE, with other Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Hollings.—Works by the Rev. G. S. HOLLINGS, Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford.

THE HEAVENLY STAIR ; or, A Ladder of the Love of God for Sinners. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

PORTA REGALIS ; or, Considerations on Prayer. *Crown 8vo. limp cloth, 1s. 6d. net ; cloth boards, 2s. net.*

MEDITATIONS ON THE DIVINE LIFE, THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, AND THE TRANSFIGURATION. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. Suggested by Passages in the Collects for the Sundays in Lent. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE WISDOM OF GOD. *Crown 8vo. 4s.*

PARADOXES OF THE LOVE OF GOD, especially as they are seen in the way of the Evangelical Counsels. *Crown 8vo. 4s.*

ONE BORN OF THE SPIRIT ; or, the Unification of our Life in God. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Hutchings.—Works by the Ven. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A. Archdeacon of Cleveland, Canon of York, Rector of Kirby Misperton, and Rural Dean of Malton.

SERMON SKETCHES from some of the Sunday Lessons throughout the Church's Year. *Vols. I and II. Crown 8vo. 5s. each.*

THE LIFE OF PRAYER : a Course of Lectures delivered in All Saints' Church, Margaret Street, during Lent. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

THE PERSON AND WORK OF THE HOLY GHOST : a Doctrinal and Devotional Treatise. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

SOME ASPECTS OF THE CROSS. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

THE MYSTERY OF THE TEMPTATION. Lent Lectures delivered at St. Mary Magdalene, Paddington. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

Hutton.—THE CHURCH OF THE SIXTH CENTURY.

Six Chapters in Ecclesiastical History. By WILLIAM HOLDEN HUTTON, B.D., Birkbeck Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History, Trinity College, Cambridge. *With 11 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

INHERITANCE OF THE SAINTS ; or, Thoughts on the Communion of Saints and the Life of the World to come. Collected chiefly from English Writers by L. P. With a Preface by the Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A. *Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Jameson.—Works by Mrs. JAMESON.

SACRED AND LEGENDARY ART, containing Legends of the Angels and Archangels, the Evangelists, the Apostles. With 19 Etchings and 187 Woodcuts. *2 vols. 8vo. 20s. net.*

LEGENDS OF THE MONASTIC ORDERS, as represented in the Fine Arts. With 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. *8vo. 10s. net.*

LEGENDS OF THE MADONNA, OR BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. *8vo. 10s. net.*

THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD, as exemplified in Works of Art. Commenced by the late Mrs. JAMESON ; continued and completed by LADY EASTLAKE. With 31 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. *2 Vols. 8vo. 20s. net.*

Jennings.—ECCLESIA ANGLICANA. A History of the Church of Christ in England from the Earliest to the Present Times. By the Rev. ARTHUR CHARLES JENNINGS, M.A. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Jukes.—Works by ANDREW JUKES.

THE NEW MAN AND THE ETERNAL LIFE. Notes on the Reiterated Amens of the Son of God. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

THE NAMES OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE : a Revelation of His Nature and Relationships. *Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

THE TYPES OF GENESIS. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

THE SECOND DEATH AND THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE ORDER AND CONNEXION OF THE CHURCH'S TEACHING, as set forth in the arrangement of the Epistles and Gospels throughout the Year. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

THE CHRISTIAN HOME. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Knox Little.—Works by W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

THE HOPES AND DECISIONS OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Ten Sermons preached in Manchester Cathedral, in Lent and Advent. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED FOR THE MOST PART IN MANCHESTER. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE MYSTERY OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

THE WITNESS OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

THE LIGHT OF LIFE. Sermons preached on Various Occasions. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOW IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Sermons preached for the most part in America. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

Lear.—Works by, and Edited by, H. L. SIDNEY LEAR.

FOR DAYS AND YEARS. A book containing a Text, Short Reading, and Hymn for Every Day in the Church's Year. *16mo.* 2s. 6d. *Also a Cheap Edition, 32mo.* 1s.; *or cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.; or with red borders, 2s. 6d.*

FIVE MINUTES. Daily Readings of Poetry. *16mo.* 3s. 6d. *Also a Cheap Edition, 32mo.* 1s.; *or cloth gilt, 1s. 6d.*

WEARINESS. A Book for the Languid and Lonely. *Large Type. Small 8vo.* 5s.

JOY: A FRAGMENT. With a slight sketch of the Author's life. *Small 8vo.* 2s. 6d.

CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHIES. *Nine Vols. Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d. *each.*

MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE, Daughter of Louis xv., known also as the Mother Tèrese de St. Augustin.

A DOMINICAN ARTIST: a Sketch of the Life of the Rev. Père Besson, of the Order of St. Dominic.

HENRI PERREYVE. By PÈRE GRATRY.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES, Bishop and Prince of Geneva.

THE REVIVAL OF PRIESTLY LIFE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IN FRANCE.

A CHRISTIAN PAINTER OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BOSSUET AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

FÉNELON, ARCHBISHOP OF CAMBRAI.

HENRI DOMINIQUE LACORDAIRE.

[continued.]

Lear.—Works by, and Edited by, H. L. SIDNEY LEAR—
continued.

DEVOTIONAL WORKS. Edited by H. L. SIDNEY LEAR. *New and Uniform Editions. Nine Vols. 16mo. 2s. 6d. each.*

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO MEN.

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO WOMEN.

A SELECTION FROM THE SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. Also *Cheap Edition, 32mo, 6d. cloth limp; 1s. cloth boards.*

THE SPIRIT OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL.

THE LIGHT OF THE CONSCIENCE. Also *Cheap Edition, 32mo, 6d. cloth limp; and 1s. cloth boards.*

SELF-RENUNCIATION. From the French.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES' OF THE LOVE OF GOD.

SELECTIONS FROM PASCAL'S 'THOUGHTS.'

Liddon.—Works by HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.

LIFE OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, and Vicar of Cuddesdon, Oxford; the Rev. R. J. WILSON, D.D., late Warden of Keble College; and the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. *With Portraits and Illustrations. Four Vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II., 36s. Vol. III., 18s. Vol. IV. 18s.*

SERMONS PREACHED ON SPECIAL OCCASIONS, 1860-1889. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS OF ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. *8vo. 7s. 6d.*

CLERICAL LIFE AND WORK: Sermons. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES: Lectures on Buddhism—Lectures on the Life of St. Paul—Papers on Dante. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS OF ST. PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. *8vo. 7s. 6d.*

EXPLANATORY ANALYSIS OF PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. *8vo. 14s.*

SERMONS ON OLD TESTAMENT SUBJECTS. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

SERMONS ON SOME WORDS OF CHRIST. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

THE DIVINITY OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1866. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

ADVENT IN ST. PAUL'S. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo. 5s.*

CHRISTMASTIDE IN ST. PAUL'S. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

PASSIONTIDE SERMONS. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

[continued.]

Liddon.—Works by HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.—*continued.*

EASTER IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Resurrection of our Lord. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo. 5s.*

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo. 5s.*

THE MAGNIFICAT. Sermons in St. Paul's. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

SOME ELEMENTS OF RELIGION. Lent Lectures. *Small 8vo. 2s. 6d. [The Crown 8vo. Edition (5s.) may still be had.]*

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS. *Crown 16mo. 1s.*

Luckock.—Works by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Dean of Lichfield.

THE HISTORY OF MARRIAGE, JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN, IN RELATION TO DIVORCE AND CERTAIN FORBIDDEN DEGREES. *Crown 8vo. 6s.*

AFTER DEATH. An Examination of the Testimony of Primitive Times respecting the State of the Faithful Dead, and their Relationship to the Living. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE BETWEEN DEATH AND JUDGMENT. Being a Sequel to *After Death*. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

FOOTPRINTS OF THE SON OF MAN, as traced by St. Mark. Being Eighty Portions for Private Study, Family Reading, and Instruction in Church. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

FOOTPRINTS OF THE APOSTLES, as traced by St. Luke in the Acts. Being Sixty Portions for Private Study, and Instruction in Church. A Sequel to 'Footprints of the Son of Man, as traced by St. Mark.' *Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 12s.*

THE DIVINE LITURGY. Being the Order for Holy Communion, Historically, Doctrinally, and Devotionally set forth, in Fifty Portions. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. The Anglican Reform—The Puritan Innovations—The Elizabethan Reaction—The Caroline Settlement. With Appendices. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE BISHOPS IN THE TOWER. A Record of Stirring Events affecting the Church and Nonconformists from the Restoration to the Revolution. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

LYRA GERMANICA. Hymns translated from the German by CATHERINE WINKWORTH. *Small 8vo. 5s.*

MacColl.—Works by the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Ripon.

CHRISTIANITY IN RELATION TO SCIENCE AND MORALS.
Crown 8vo. 6s.

LIFE HERE AND HEREAFTER : Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Mason.—Works by A. J. MASON, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge and Canon of Canterbury.

THE CONDITIONS OF OUR LORD'S LIFE UPON EARTH.
Being the Bishop Paddock Lectures, 1896. To which is prefixed part of a First Professorial Lecture at Cambridge. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL UNITY. Four Lectures delivered in St. Asaph Cathedral. *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE FAITH OF THE GOSPEL. A Manual of Christian Doctrine. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d. *Cheap Edition.* *Crown 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE RELATION OF CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM. As taught in Holy Scripture and the Fathers. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Maturin.—Works by the Rev. B. W. MATURIN, sometime Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley.

SOME PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. *Crown 8vo.* 4s. 6d.

PRACTICAL STUDIES ON THE PARABLES OF OUR LORD. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

Monro.—SACRED ALLEGORIES. By Rev. EDWARD MONRO.

In One Volume, with Illustrations, crown 8vo. 5s.

In Six Parts, Small 8vo. 1s. each.

THE DARK RIVER.

THE VAST ARMY.

THE COMBATANTS.

THE REVELLERS, ETC.

THE JOURNEY HOME.

THE DARK MOUNTAINS.

Mortimer.—Works by the Rev. A. G. MORTIMER, D.D., Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia.

JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION:
Addresses for Good Friday and Easter.
Crown 8vo. 5s.

CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE: A Manual of Theological Instruction for Confirmation and First Communion. *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

HELPS TO MEDITATION: Sketches for Every Day in the Year.

Vol. I. ADVENT TO TRINITY. *8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Vol. II. TRINITY TO ADVENT. *8vo.* 7s. 6d.

STORIES FROM GENESIS: Sermons for Children. *Crown 8vo.* 4s.

THE LAWS OF HAPPINESS; or, The Beatitudes as teaching our Duty to God, Self, and our Neighbour. *18mo.* 2s.

THE LAWS OF PENITENCE: Addresses on the Words of our Lord from the Cross. *16mo.* 1s. 6d.

SERMONS IN MINIATURE FOR EXTEMPORE PREACHERS: Sketches for Every Sunday and Holy Day of the Christian Year. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

NOTES ON THE SEVEN PENTIAL PSALMS, chiefly from Patristic Sources. *Fcp. 8vo.* 3s. 6d.

THE SEVEN LAST WORDS OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER: with Meditations on some Scenes in His Passion. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

LEARN OF JESUS CHRIST TO DIE: Addresses on the Words of our Lord from the Cross, taken as Teaching the way of Preparation for Death. *16mo.* 2s.

Mozley.—Works by J. B. MOZLEY, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

ESSAYS, HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. *Two Vols. 8vo. 24s.*

EIGHT LECTURES ON MIRACLES. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1865. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

RULING IDEAS IN EARLY AGES AND THEIR RELATION TO OLD TESTAMENT FAITH. *8vo. 6s.*

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, and on Various Occasions. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

SERMONS, PAROCHIAL AND OCCASIONAL. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

A REVIEW OF THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Neale and Littledale.—A COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS. From Primitive and Mediæval Writers; and from the various Office-books and Hymns of the Roman, Mozarabic, Ambrosian, Gallican, Greek, Coptic, Armenian, and Syriac Rites. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D., and the Rev. R. F. LITTEDALE, LL.D. *Crown 8vo. 4 vols. 10s. 6d. each.*

Newbolt.—Works by the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral.

THE GOSPEL OF EXPERIENCE; or, the Witness of Human Life to the truth of Revelation. Being the Boyle Lectures for 1895. *Crown 8vo. 5s.*

COUNSELS OF FAITH AND PRACTICE: being Sermons preached on various occasions. *New and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.*

SPECULUM SACERDOTUM; or, the Divine Model of the Priestly Life. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT. Being Ten Addresses bearing on the Spiritual Life. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

THE MAN OF GOD. *Small 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

THE PRAYER BOOK: Its Voice and Teaching. *Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

Newman.—Works by JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D., sometime Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN DURING HIS LIFE IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. With a brief Autobiography. Edited, at Cardinal Newman's request, by ANNE MOZLEY. *2 vols. Crown 8vo. 7s.*

PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS. *Eight Vols. Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. each. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d. each.*

SELECTION, ADAPTED TO THE SEASONS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR, from the 'Parochial and Plain Sermons,' *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.*

FIFTEEN SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.*

SERMONS BEARING UPON SUBJECTS OF THE DAY. *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

LECTURES ON THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION. *Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. Cheaper Edition. 3s. 6d.*

* * * A Complete List of Cardinal Newman's Works can be had on Application.

Osborne.—Works by EDWARD OSBORNE, Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford.

THE CHILDREN'S SAVIOUR. Instructions to Children on the Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. *Illustrated.* 16mo. 2s. 6d.

THE SAVIOUR KING. Instructions to Children on Old Testament Types and Illustrations of the Life of Christ. *Illustrated.* 16mo. 2s. 6d.

THE CHILDREN'S FAITH. Instructions to Children on the Apostles' Creed. *Illustrated.* 16mo. 2s. 6d.

Ottley.—ASPECTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: being the Bampton Lectures for 1897. By ROBERT LAWRENCE OTTLEY, M.A., successively Student of Christ Church and Fellow of Magdalen College; sometime Principal of the Pusey House. 8vo. 16s.

OUTLINES OF CHURCH TEACHING: a Series of Instructions for the Sundays and chief Holy Days of the Christian Year. For the Use of Teachers. By C. C. G. With Preface by the Very Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. *Crown* 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Oxenden.—Works by the Right Rev. ASHTON OXENDEN, sometime Bishop of Montreal.

PLAIN SERMONS, to which is prefixed a Memorial Portrait. *Crown* 8vo. 5s.

PEACE AND ITS HINDRANCES. *Crown* 8vo. 1s. sewed; 2s. cloth.

THE PATHWAY OF SAFETY; or, Counsel to the Awakened. *Fcap.* 8vo, large type. 2s. 6d. *Cheap Edition.* Small type, limp, 1s.

THE EARNEST COMMUNICANT. *New Red Rubric Edition.* 32mo, cloth. 2s. *Common Edition.* 32mo. 1s.

OUR CHURCH AND HER SERVICES. *Fcap.* 8vo. 2s. 6d.

FAMILY PRAYERS FOR FOUR WEEKS. First Series. *Fcap.* 8vo. 2s. 6d. Second Series. *Fcap.* 8vo. 2s. 6d.

LARGE TYPE EDITION. Two Series in one Volume. *Crown* 8vo. 6s.

COTTAGE SERMONS; or, Plain Words to the Poor. *Fcap.* 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THOUGHTS FOR HOLY WEEK. 16mo, cloth. 1s. 6d.

DECISION. 18mo. 1s. 6d.

THE HOME BEYOND; or, A Happy Old Age. *Fcap.* 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THE LABOURING MAN'S BOOK. 18mo, large type, cloth. 1s. 6d.

Oxenham.—THE VALIDITY OF PAPAL CLAIMS: Lectures delivered in Rome. By F. NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, D.D., English Chaplain at Rome. With a Preface by the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK. *Crown* 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Paget.—Works by FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church.
STUDIES IN THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER: Sermons. With an
Introductory Essay. *Crown 8vo.* 6s. 6d.

THE SPIRIT OF DISCIPLINE: Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 6s. 6d.

FACULTIES AND DIFFICULTIES FOR BELIEF AND DIS-
BELIEF. *Crown 8vo.* 6s. 6d.

THE HALLOWING OF WORK. Addresses given at Eton, January
16-18, 1888. *Small 8vo.* 2s.

Percival.—SOME HELPS FOR SCHOOL LIFE. Sermons
preached at Clifton College, 1862-1879. By J. PERCIVAL, D.D., LL.D.,
Lord Bishop of Hereford. New Edition, with New Preface. *Crown*
8vo. 3s. 6d.

Percival.—THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS. Treated Theo-
logically and Historically. By HENRY R. PERCIVAL, M.A., D.D.,
Author of 'A Digest of Theology,' 'The Doctrine of the Episcopal
Church,' etc. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

POCKET MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR THE HOURS,
ETC. With the Collects from the Prayer Book. *Royal 32mo.* 1s.

Powell.—THE PRINCIPLE OF THE INCARNATION.
With especial Reference to the Relation between our Lord's Divine
Omniscience and His Human Consciousness. By the Rev. H. C.
POWELL, M.A. of Oriel College, Oxford; Rector of Wylde and Pre-
bendary of Salisbury Cathedral. *8vo.* 16s.

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS. By a CLERGYMAN. With
Prefaces by H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., and the BISHOP OF
LINCOLN. *Crown 8vo.*

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. 4s. 6d.

THE PSALMS. 5s.

ISAIAH. 4s. 6d.

THE MINOR PROPHETS. 4s. 6d.

THE HOLY GOSPELS. 4s. 6d.

ACTS TO REVELATIONS. 6s.

PRIEST'S (THE) PRAYER BOOK. Containing Private
Prayers and Intercessions; Occasional, School, and Parochial Offices;
Offices for the Visitation of the Sick, with Notes, Readings, Collects,
Hymns, Litanies, etc. With a brief Pontifical. By the late Rev. R. F.
LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L., and Rev. J. EDWARD VAUX, M.A.,
F.S.A. *New Edition, Revised.* 20th Thousand. *Post 8vo.* 6s. 6d.

Pullan.—LECTURES ON RELIGION. By the Rev. LEIGHTON
PULLAN, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Lecturer in Theology at
Oriel and Queen's Colleges, Oxford. *Crown 8vo.* 6s.

Pusey.—LIFE OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D.

By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, and Vicar of Cuddesdon, Oxford; the Rev. R. J. WILSON, D.D., late Warden of Keble College; and the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. *With Portraits and Illustrations. Four Vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II., 36s. Vol. III., 18s. Vol. IV. 18s.*

Randolph.—Works by B. W. RANDOLPH, M.A., Principal of the Theological College and Hon. Canon of Ely.

THE THRESHOLD OF THE SANCTUARY: being Short Chapters on the Inner Preparation for the Priesthood. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

THE LAW OF SINAI: being Devotional Addresses on the Ten Commandments delivered to Ordinands. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Rede.—Works by WYLLYS REDE, D.D., Rector of the Church of the Incarnation, and Canon of the Cathedral, Atlanta, Georgia.

STRIVING FOR THE MASTERY: Daily Lessons for Lent. *Cr. 8vo. 5s.*

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS: a Lost Link in the Chain of the Church's Creed. With a Preface by LORD HALIFAX. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Reynolds.—THE SUPERNATURAL IN NATURE: A Verification by Free Use of Science. By JOSEPH WILLIAM REYNOLDS, M.A., Past President of Sion College, Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral. *New and Cheaper Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.***Sanday.**—INSPIRATION: Eight Lectures on the Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1893. By W. SANDAY, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. *New and Cheaper Edition, with New Preface. 8vo. 7s. 6d.***Scudamore.**—STEPS TO THE ALTAR: a Manual of Devotion for the Blessed Eucharist. By the Rev. W. E. SCUDAMORE, M.A. *Royal 32mo. 1s.*

On toned paper, with red rubrics, 2s: The same, with Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, 2s. 6d; Demy 18mo. cloth, 1s; Demy 18mo. cloth, large type, 1s. 3d; Imperial 32mo. limp cloth, 6d.

Simpson.—THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE. By the Rev W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Regent's Park *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Strong.—CHRISTIAN ETHICS : being the Bampton Lectures for 1895. By THOMAS B. STRONG, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Durham. *New and Cheaper Edition.* 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Tee.—THE SANCTUARY OF SUFFERING. By ELEANOR TEE, Author of 'This Everyday Life,' etc. With a Preface by the Rev. J. P. F. DAVIDSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthias', Earl's Court; President of the 'Guild of All Souls.' *Crown 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Williams.—Works by the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D.

A DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL NARRATIVE. *Eight Vols. Crown 8vo.* 5s. each.

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| THOUGHTS ON THE STUDY OF THE HOLY GOSPELS. | OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Third Year). |
| A HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. | THE HOLY WEEK. |
| OUR LORD'S NATIVITY. | OUR LORD'S PASSION. |
| OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Second Year). | OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION. |

FEMALE CHARACTERS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. A Series of Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

THE CHARACTERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

THE APOCALYPSE. With Notes and Reflections. *Crown 8vo.* 5s.

SERMONS ON THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo.* 5s. each.

PLAIN SERMONS ON CATECHISM. *Two Vols. Cr. 8vo.* 5s. each.

Wilson.—THOUGHTS ON CONFIRMATION. By Rev. R. J. WILSON, D.D., late Warden of Keble Cottage. 16mo.

Wirgman.—THE DOCTRINE OF CONFIRMATION CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO HOLY BAPTISM AS A SACRAMENTAL ORDINANCE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH: with a Preliminary Historical Survey of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. By A. THEODORE WIRGMAN, B.D., D.C.L., Vice-Provost of St. Mary's Collegiate Church, Port Elizabeth, South Africa. *Cr. 8vo.* 7s. 6d.

Wordsworth.—Works by CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., sometime Bishop of Lincoln.

THE HOLY BIBLE (the Old Testament). With Notes, Introductions, and Index. *Imperial 8vo.*

Vol. I. THE PENTATEUCH. 25s. Vol. II. JOSHUA TO SAMUEL. 15s.
Vol. III. KINGS to ESTHER. 15s. Vol. IV. JOB to SONG OF
SOLOMON. 25s. Vol. V. ISAIAH TO EZEKIEL. 25s. Vol. VI.
DANIEL, MINOR PROPHETS, and Index. 15s.

Also supplied in 12 Parts. Sold separately.

[continued.]

Wordsworth.—Works by CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D.,
sometime Bishop of Lincoln—*continued.*

THE NEW TESTAMENT, in the Original Greek. With Notes, Intro-
ductions, and Indices. *Imperial 8vo.*

Vol. I. GOSPELS AND ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. 23s. Vol. II.
EPISTLES, APOCALYPSE, and Indices. 37s.
Also supplied in 4 Parts. Sold separately.

LECTURES ON INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE. *Small 8vo.*
1s. 6d. cloth. 1s. sewed.

A CHURCH HISTORY TO A.D. 451. *Four Vols. Crown 8vo.*

Vol. I. TO THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA, A.D. 325. 8s. 6d. Vol. II.
FROM THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA TO THAT OF CONSTANTINOPLE.
6s. Vol. III. CONTINUATION. 6s. Vol. IV. CONCLUSION, TO
THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON, A.D. 451. 6s.

THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS: a Manual of Instruction on the
Church and the Anglican Branch of it. *12mo. 2s. 6d.*

ELEMENTS OF INSTRUCTION ON THE CHURCH. *16mo.*
1s. cloth. 6d. sewed.

ON UNION WITH ROME. *Small 8vo. 1s. 6d. Sewed, 1s.*

THE HOLY YEAR: Original Hymns. *16mo. 2s. 6d. and 1s. Limp, 6d.*

„ „ With Music. Edited by W. H. MONK. *Square 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

MISCELLANIES, Literary and Religious. *Three Vols. 8vo. 36s.*

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER
DEATH. *32mo. 1s.*

Wordsworth.—Works by JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of
Salisbury.

THE HOLY COMMUNION: Four Visitation Addresses. *1891.*
Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE ONE RELIGION: Truth, Holiness, and Peace desired by the
Nations, and revealed by Jesus Christ. Eight Lectures delivered before
the University of Oxford in 1831. *Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

UNIVERSITY SERMONS ON GOSPEL SUBJECTS. *Sm. 8vo. 2s. 6d.*

PRAYERS FOR USE IN COLLEGE. *16mo. 1s.*

5,000/2/98.

Date Due

[illegible]

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01033 4862